DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 699 CG 003 829

By-Katz, Joseph; And Others

No Time for Youth--Growth and Constraint in College Students. Student Life and Its Problems.

Pub Date 68

Note- 165p.;This abstract encompasses only Part Three, Student Life and Its Problems, pages 255-414.

Available from-The complete book is available from Jossey Bass Publishing Company, 615 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94111 ($10.00).

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.35

Descriptors-Activism, Alcoholism, College Housing, *College Students, Psychiatric Services, *Student Attitudes, *Student Behavior, *Student Characteristics, *Student Motivation

Chapter Seven, by Marjorie M. Lazoff, "Residential Groups and Individual Development," describes living conditions, social environment, and reactions to them of several groups of undergraduate men at Stanford University. Chapter Eight, by Ving Ellis, "Students Who Seek Psychiatric Help," is based on interviews and questionnaire data from 493 undergraduate students who come to the psychiatric clinic at the University of California, Berkeley. Data is given on their families, intelligence, grade-point average, entry complaints, and personality inventory scores. Several case studies follow. Chapter Nine, by Nevitt Sanford and Susan Singer, "Drinking and Personality," reports a study relating drinking and abstaining behaviors to attitudes about drinking, and to several personality characteristics. Chapter 10, by Max M. Levin, "Changes in Authoritarianism," compares students whose authoritarianism scores changed much over four undergraduate years, with those whose scores changed little, over several personality dimensions. Chapter 11, by Joseph Katz, "The Activist Revolution of 1964," gives a history of the beginning of the mass student protest at the University of California at Berkeley, then discusses personality characteristics of Free Speech Movement participants. Lengthy quotations from an interview with one activist conclude the chapter. (BP)

UTH
AINT
NTS

ED026699

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Jossey Bass Publishing Co. p255-414
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Joseph Katz & Associates

Harold A. Korn
Ving Ellis
Peter Madison
Susan Singer
Marjorie M. Lozoff
Max M. Levin
Nevitt Sanford

CG003529

Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers
615 Montgomery Street • San Francisco • 1968

CONTENTS

Preface xiii

The Authors xix

PART ONE: HOW STUDENTS CHANGE

1. Four Years of Growth, Conflict, and Compliance
   Joseph Katz 3

2. Dynamics of Development and Constraint: Two Case Studies
   Peter Madison 74

3. Personality Scale Changes From the Freshman Year to the Senior Year
   Harold A. Korn 162

PART TWO: FROM CURRICULUM TO CAREER

4. Differences in Student Response to the Curriculum
   Harold A. Korn 187

5. Careers: Choice, Chance, or Inertia?
   Harold A. Korn 207

6. Incomplete Liberation: Two Premedical Students
Harold A. Korn 239

PART THREE: STUDENT LIFE AND ITS PROBLEMS

7. Residential Groups and Individual Development
Marjorie M. Lozoff 255

8. Students Who Seek Psychiatric Help
Ving Ellis 318

9. Drinking and Personality
Nevitt Sanford and Susan Singer 348

10. Changes in Authoritarianism
Max M. Levin 376

11. The Activist Revolution of 1964
Joseph Katz 386

PART FOUR: RECOMMENDATIONS

12. Recommendations for Policy and Philosophy
Joseph Katz 417

PART FIVE: APPENDICES

Note on the Collection and Analysis of the Data 449

Guide to Further Reading 454

Index 457

PART THREE

Student Life and Its Problems

7

RESIDENTIAL GROUPS AND INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT

Marjorie M. Lozoff

The residential milieu has a strong effect on the undergraduate student. It may either aid or retard his social, academic, and emotional development. In this chapter we will describe the living conditions and reactions to them of several groups of undergraduate men. The description is based primarily on information given to us by our interview sample—42 men who were interviewed twice a year during their four undergraduate years—and on the test scores and responses of our questionnaire sample—271 men who attended Stanford University from 1961 to 1965, and who responded to the Senior Questionnaire. Additional information was obtained from interviews with other undergraduates, graduate students, resident advisors, and faculty, as well as from class observations and meetings with groups of students.

Each student in the interview sample was seen by more than one interviewer. Frequent staff discussions enabled us to pool our observations and maintain an overall impression of the interview sample. With the consent of the forty-two men, written descriptions of the them were obtained from their friends. We also have freshman and senior psychological test responses, self-ratings, and written material, ratings by interviewers and friends, aptitude scores, and academic transcripts for these men.

Out of a total of 281 men who responded to the Senior Questionnaire, we selected all those who had clearly defined residence histories (N = 236). This sample was divided as follows: fraternity men who lived on campus (N = 69); fraternity men who lived off campus (N = 44); unaffiliated men who lived in off-campus apartments (N = 44); dormitory men (N = 42); and eating-club men (N = 37). This sample represents about a third of the men in the senior class.

Most of the students we studied had postponed many of the social and developmental tasks of adolescence until their college years. During high school, many of them had concentrated on proving their competence as students in order to gain admittance to the university. Some students had postponed development in the social area regretfully and others, because of feelings of inadequacy, had utilized the reality of the difficulty of college entrance as a rationalization for limiting social involvement. In any case, most of them looked forward to an improvement in their social relations at college, where they hoped to find themselves among peers of comparable ambitions and intellectual capacities.

As we interviewed students, we were impressed by the importance they placed on their social development. Some students handled this area with painful avoidance or denial, but most appeared to be deeply involved in trying to understand themselves and their relations with other people. This absorbed their energies and affected their academic and intellectual activities. The university as an institution showed relatively little interest in facilitating their social development. The challenge of aiding youth in developing academic, intellectual, and vocational skills was its area of competence, and the problem of supplying housing, social facilities, and proper personal guidance was seen as a peripheral task. The students related to each other in ways that were both constructive and destructive. By trial and error, they developed varying degrees of social skill and responsibility. In spite of egocentric involvement with their own pressing personal developmental tasks, they offered various kinds of guidance to each other. Receptivity to peer pressures varied with the anxiety of the recipient, his stage of separation from his parents, his sense of autonomy, and innumerable other factors, including identification with charismatic fellow students.

Important developmental tasks of late adolescence seemed to depend upon the support of peers for solution. These tasks included evaluating oneself as a person separate from one's family, and clarifying certain aspects of one's sexual role and career goals. As students face the actuality of the separateness of their existence and the need to seek out and adapt to peers for gratification of their emotional needs, painful emotional adjustments often ensue. These tasks have a particular urgency, and cannot be postponed because of academic demands. Often membership in an affiliation group, or, conversely, inability to become part of a group, have meaningful effects on this process. In either instance, sharing experiences and values with one or several friends influences the tempo of the separation process and provides experiences that the students utilize in clarifying their self-concepts and goals. As Joseph Katz has commented: "Most students have relatively narrow ranges of friendship associations. To be stressed is the fact that these groups make very specific demands on such matters as when and how alcohol is consumed, what kinds of people of the same or opposite sex one should associate with, and even what kinds of views are at the fringe but acceptable, and which are purely beyond the fringe. The peer pressures receive added force from the fact that they are usually derivative from and parallel to the views held in the student's own home situation. Therefore, deviation imperils not just one's association with the group, but even one's deeper ties with one's upbringing." Our purpose is to describe the influence of family values, housing-affiliation groups, and peers on individual development.

All entering students as Stanford are required to live in dormitories. The bulk of the men live in a complex of houses exclusively reserved for freshmen. The assumption that young people, accustomed to homes, will adjust easily to the challenge of living in a multi-purpose room with a stranger is an unrealistic one. Their introduction to dormitory living occurs at a time when they are feeling insecure and at a loss for familiar cues. Within the freshman dorms, personality types who consciously avoid each other are sometimes thrown together. As roommates, they are placed in little box-like rooms where privacy is not possible. Many of our students reacted to the freshman experience by intensification of dislike of those who were very different from themselves in backgrounds, values, or personalities, and became determined to choose future housing arrangements that would protect them from such differences.

After their freshman year, the men at Stanford are free to choose fraternities or dormitories as their residence, or to move off campus. During the period studied, approximately fifty per cent of the men students belonged to fraternities, and about the same percentage was reflected in our interview sample. Besides their numerical superiority over other groups in our study, the fraternity men were objects of comparison, reluctant admiration, or angry disapproval to other men and women. The fraternity system seemed, at its best, to actively encourage a sense of loyalty and security for the in-group; and at its worst, to permissively allow regressive and undemocratic behavior. The fraternity men, on the whole, differed from other groups in their appearance, interests, and attitudes toward group activities. The general impression made by most of the fraternity men on the interviewers was one of self-confidence, physical grace, and attractiveness. This was true regardless of their social class, or the quality of the fraternity in which they had membership. This appearance was not accidental; it was the result of several factors in the men's precollege experiences. First, most of them came from sociable families. Second, during their high school careers, many of the fraternity men had been in the limelight by virtue of positions as cheerleaders, athletes, or student body officers. Most of these men were not characterized by outstanding intellectual or artistic interests, but they had acquired a certain social know-how: they drank alcoholic beverages, had considerable experience in dating girls, and considered themselves superior to their high school classmates in the area of group participation and social activity.

The average verbal and mathematical aptitudes of the fraternity men were lower than those of men in the other groups. This was particularly true with regard to verbal aptitudes.[1] On the other hand, if they had been tested and rated on the basis of aptitude in physical activities or group participation, the fraternity men probably would have been on top. In general, these students enjoy the company of other men and want security and response from their peers. As a freshman, the son of a professor from a large university explained his interest in group and social activities thus: "A lot of people like to be by themselves—to just know one or two people really well—and aren't interested in group activities. I'm not like this, so I better join a fraternity. It's hard for independent freshmen to get dates; there's an awful lot of upperclassmen who don't have girls, and they reach down to the freshman girls. A lot of girls come to college and are interested in fraternity parties, but they aren't much interested in freshman men."

Another student, at the university on a scholarship and from a small-town, low-income family, gave this reason for joining a fraternity: "Joining a fraternity is a unique experience, because although it is selective, and the selection process isn't always fair, you still find—after rush is done—that you are living with people with whom you have common interests—people with whom you can get going in one direction easier than if you were in a dorm. Consequently you'll have a unity you might not achieve elsewhere. You can organize things and get them going."

Their differences in scholastic aptitude were a source of guidance for these men in planning their futures, and in their behavior during their college careers. From data based on a questionnaire mailed to graduates of the class of 1965 in January, 1966, it appeared that a large proportion of fraternity men were planning careers that involved business or legal training. It was apparent that many of them aimed for managerial and administrative positions rather than professional or artistic careers (see Table 44). The fraternity men appeared to be interested in a model that would be appropriate for potential leaders of men, persuaders of men, and decision-makers. Their physical vigor and the relatively limited emphasis they placed on their verbal skills may have contributed to their tendency to make quick and easy decisions, and to avoid introspection and complexity.

---

[1] The freshman mean scores for the verbal part of the Scholastic Aptitude Test indicate that students who later become fraternity men (N = 324) scored about twenty points below the off-campus men (N = 122) and clubmen (N = 88), and about forty points below the dormitory men (N = 66).

TABLE 44

POSTGRADUATE STATUS OF SENIOR MEN ONE YEAR AFTER GRADUATION [a]
(IN PER CENT)

	Eating Club (N = 44)	*Frat/On* (N = 93)	*Frat/Off* (N = 55)	*Off-Campus* (N = 51)	*Dorm* (N = 37)
Business School	20	22	16	4	3
Prof. Schools					
Engineer	16	5	4	12	8
Law	7	28	25	18	16
Medicine	7	9	15	14	16
Graduate Schools					
Science and Mathematics	14	9	9	8	19
Humanities	11	5	7	16	16
Social Science [b]	22	14	24	18	14
Education	0	4	0	6	5
Other	3	4	0	6	4

[a] The five living groups were compared by an χ^2 test to check differences in representation among the graduate fields, excluding "Education" and "Other." The test yielded $p < .02$.

[b] The fraternity off-campus students were in international relations, economics, and political science (none were in psychology, sociology or anthropology).

In the Senior Questionnaire, the men indicated the activities they had participated in during their college years (see Table 45). The fraternity men were significantly different from the other groups of students in their interest in sports, social activities, and parties. This is not surprising, in light of their skills and future life goals. On the other hand, they reported less activity than the other groups did in activities involving cultural interests and services to less fortunate people. Life within the fraternity en-

TABLE 45

ACTIVITIES: PERCENTAGE OF SUBJECTS IN EACH TYPE OF LIVING GROUP WHO PARTICIPATED FREQUENTLY [a]

	Frat/On (N = 69)	*Frat/Off* (N = 44)	*Eating Club* (N = 37)	*Off-Campus* (N = 44)	*Dorm* (N = 42)	*p*
Reading						
Non-fiction	45	50	62	52	62	
Fiction	30	39	41	39	26	
Cultural and Service						
Lectures	19	16	30	23	15	
Student committes	19	16	19	15	5	
Service activities	7	7	16	0	7	
Creative expression	10	14	16	23	17	
Museums, drama, symphony	6	7	16	13	19	*
Political Activities						
Campus	12	7	14	5	7	
National and community	1	0	14	0	5	
Civil Rights	0	5	3	2	5	*
Social Activities						
Social activities, parties	71	80	46	34	12	***
Seeking out off-beat people and places	4	9	5	7	2	**
Travel	43	45	30	45	21	***
Movies	19	25	32	41	20	**
Church	20	9	16	9	21	
Athletics						
Spectators sports	75	57	43	39	24	***
Participant sports	65	57	35	27	9	***
Hiking	13	9	8	7	2	

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
*** $p < .001$.

[a] In the Questionnaire, the students were asked whether they had participated in each activity frequently, occasionally, or never. Where the frequency in the "frequently" or "never" categories was extremely small, they were combined with the "occasionally" category, resulting in 2 x 5 contingency tables with 4 df.

hanced the interests that the men had prior to college entrance. On the positive side, this included a willingness to assume responsibility for group activities, and to offer loyalty and a sense of belonging to a chosen group of fellow students. On the negative side, this often led to an intensification of a high school model of masculinity, including admiration of heavy drinking and conquest of women, contempt for individuals who were less attractive, strong, or adventurous, and a condoning of aggressive behavior toward individuals who were not in the in-group. Although most men at Stanford drank frequently during their college years, the fraternity men were more apt to take "getting drunk" for granted as acceptable and anticipated behavior. Two-thirds of the fraternity men and the unaffiliated men who lived off campus described themselves as being drunk more than once during the senior year, in contrast to 43 per cent of the clubmen, and 21 per cent of the dormitory men. However, most of the men drank more heavily during their sophomore year, when they first entered the fraternity, than they did in later years. Individuals who were not able to control their heavy drinking had difficulty surviving at the university.

Regardless of social class, the fraternity men tended to come from families where the parents were younger than those of unaffiliated men. On the average, they were more likely to have brothers; and less likely to have sisters, or to be only children. From our interview sample of twenty-two fraternity men, we derived the impression that although each of the fraternities had a number of members from minority or low-income groups, the pace-setters in the fraternities were men who came from "white Anglo-Saxon" families where the parents had positions of affluence and influence within their communities. We will refer to these fraternity men as "inheritors."

Of the thirteen "inheritors" whom we interviewed for a four-year period, six came from prep schools, and the others came from public schools in upper-middle-class suburbs. Since the successful families of the "inheritors" represent models that appealed to most of the fraternity men regardless of their class background, a description of these parents is worthy of special note. The "inheritors" viewed their fathers with evident admiration. In some instances, the fathers were respected as leaders in their communities, and sometimes they had national or international reputations. These fathers were often above the layer of management where conformity and depersonalization is evident, and their strengths seemed to lie in a capacity to understand different points of view, and to make and assume responsibility for clear-cut decisions. The sons were aware of this. They indicated respect for their fathers, but also some distance from them. The fathers had often been away from home, but the homes they had been away from reflected the power, wealth, and status of the father. When the fathers had been home, they had been interested in the sons' athletic, social, and academic achievements. Not infrequently, a father would express nostalgia for his carefree college days. Many of these fathers drank heavily, and belonged to elite country clubs.

As Nevitt Sanford says, "inheritor" fraternity men are not "Momma's boys." In fact, some of the contradictions in their attitudes about women resulted from their parental situation. The mothers were younger than the fathers, and had few occupational or intellectual interests, although most of them had college educations. Home and community activities, mainly social or esthetic, occupied their days. References to the mothers by their sons were often affectionate but condescending. The sons discounted the ability of their mothers to have objective and balanced opinions. The mothers appeared to their sons to be less well-informed than the fathers, and to be more opinionated and less tolerant regarding political and social matters. The mothers were described as attractive women, devoted to their families and friends; but the fathers were described as logical, clear-thinking achievers.

The actual existence of diversity within the fraternity is often questioned by outsiders; yet the fraternity men we interviewed frequently stressed this as one of the main advantages of fraternity membership. The outsider may be impressed by the fraternity man's self-confidence, physical attractiveness, and interest in masculine gregarious activities. If the outsider is hostile to fraternities, he may stress the fraternity members' bias against "non-fraternity" types, lack of judgment or control with regard to drinking and pranks, and general anti-intellectual and anti-introspective attitude. Fraternity men, taking for granted their common interest in social and athletic activities, are impressed by the variations within fraternity membership of geographic areas of origin, social class background, and choice of majors. In most of the fraternities that we studied, the core group was social, athletic, and interested in managerial positions or the professions; few students were interested in the arts, pure science, or college teaching.

Differences do exist between fraternities and within each fraternity. One difference is the quality of autonomy. Almost half of the fraternity men lived in off-campus apartments. These students appeared to differ somewhat in interests, relationships, self-concepts, and possibly development from those of their brothers who preferred to live on campus. The men who lived off campus appeared to be less interested in sports and more interested in parties, travel, and "off-beat" places. They were more inclined to read fiction and to participate in civil rights activities. Both groups of fraternity men were relatively disinterested in visiting museums, or attending plays or symphonies. The off-campus fraternity men appeared to have more complex relationships with others than their on-campus brothers did: more than twice as many off-campus as on-campus fraternity men described family problems and crises in relationships as stimulants for change.

Although both groups of fraternity men dated more frequently during the four years of college than other groups of men did, the off-campus fraternity men felt that they had deeper relationships with women, and 43 per cent of them, in contrast to 20 per cent of the on-campus fraternity men, indicated that they frequently had enjoyed a high degree of intimacy with women. In addition, the off-campus fraternity men attributed changes regarding attitudes and behavior to the influence of women with greater frequency than the fraternity men who lived on campus did. This might indicate that the off-campus men were at a stage in their heterosexual development in which closeness to women had more significance than masculine gregariousness did.

Only 18 per cent of the off-campus fraternity men described being away from home as an important factor causing change; whereas 40 per cent of the fraternity men who chose to live on campus attributed changes to this adjustment. The on-compus fraternity men gave interviewers the impression of being more conservative and conforming. They showed considerable interest in social activities connected with churches, were very active in athletics, and appeared to enjoy participation in student committees and campus politics. The fraternity men who lived off campus showed little interest in affairs connected with churches or in campus politics. These differences suggest that the two groups of men differed in a feeling of independence and in the timing of their developmental tasks. Possibly the off-campus men had moved more quickly away from their homes and toward heterosexual involvements.

A question dealing with feelings of self-satisfaction indicated that of all the groups, the fraternity men had the greatest feeling of self-satisfaction upon matriculation. When the fraternity men first arrived on campus, the social education they had received at home stood them in good stead in making new friends. Besides that, they had experienced the advantage of being recognized leaders in their high-school communities. Many of them also had known the satisfaction of having parents who were prominent and well-educated. The freshmen who were sons of alumni here or at other prestigious universities may have had a greater sense of familiarity and belonging than students who were the first of their families to attend this type of institution did. Except with regard to academic achievement, most fraternity men felt relatively "self-satisfied" as freshmen. Within the fraternity group, however, the off-campus men were less self-satisfied upon entrance. Over the four years, the fraternity men as a group moved in the direction of feeling more dissatisfied with themselves, with the on-campus fraternity men indicating the greatest dissatisfaction.

Let us describe these students who were representative of the "inheritor" subgroup:

(1) A task-oriented, pleasant, rather tense young man from a military background who joined a "straight-arrow" (conservative) fraternity was described as follows: "His fraternity brothers admired his sincerity but found him too conservative in his sense of duty, which restrained him from joining others in impromptu seeking of new experiences." Although he liked his fraternity brothers, and said he chose them because he wanted to be with people like himself, he also felt that they were only "out for a good time." His own attitude was: "I have long-range plans and have to work for them." By his senior year, however, his fraternity brothers had helped him ease up, and he was enjoying an occasional "evening on the town."

(2) A wealthy West Coast student, whose intellectual and esthetic development during his college years was more impressive than his academic achievements, as a senior commented: "I came to college thinking I had to go to college, and I didn't think any more about it. I never thought about a career or why I was here. Both of my brothers had gone here, but I never had a serious discussion with them or my parents. I had a lot of fun, basically. I had a car; I went to the city a lot; went out with a lot of different girls. I have always dated Stanford girls exclusively. . . . Sometimes I surprise myself by how immature I am, and then sometimes I feel like an adult. I don't know, but I think I've achieved a very high level of education—much higher than I thought I would—in personal matters as well as in broad education. I like people much more than I used to, and I have a great deal more awareness of what makes a democracy run. I have more latitude in speaking about world situations, and I have more freedom to express my beliefs. I can stand up in social situations and be myself more than I used to be. I think I have more courage to speak out."

(3) A third student, who came from a well-established and prominent family in the East, joined a fraternity composed of students deeply interested in international affairs and government. (One perceptive woman student said of these men: "Their rebellion seems to be directed into fairly constructive channels. It's not so much a personal rebellion against the world; their way of dealing with rebellion is organizing things to deal with it.") He described his experiences thus: "Our House is divided into two groups—the group I'm with, who spend a lot of time drinking and having a good time, and the other group, which studies a great deal. We profit from this. In prep school, there was a general awareness that was confined to understanding people and social things—this is true here, but it extends to books and subjects. My House places value on 'eccentricity'—we have a larger proportion of interesting people in my fraternity than in the university as a whole—the university attempts to achieve a norm of personality. I viewed the freshman year as a year for prodigality, which would be followed by years of work. For as I observed, and as appeared logical, life is most productive when lived to the extreme—no matter what the extreme may be." After a year of poor grades, heavy drinking, and gregarious activities and pranks, this student

was able to settle down to serious academic and intellectual achievements and to move toward close personal relationships.

None of the "inheritors" just described were at Stanford on academic or athletic scholarships. None of them were driven to maintain a high grade-point average, nor to devote long hours to sports practice. In general, if any of the "inheritors" worked, they did so voluntarily, to bolster their self-esteem or sociability, or to test their ability to get along with other social groups. None of them participated in major athletics, although they were all enthusiastic supporters of varsity and professional athletics. They enjoyed intramural sports, and liked to keep fit and to compete physically on an informal level. Academically, a number of them did well enough to gain admission to outstanding graduate schools, but three of them were within the lowest 10 per cent of their graduating class.

These men accepted their academic inferiority at the university with a grace that might have been difficult for those with less assurance of superiority. Although fraternities disapprove of poor academic achievement, a member is not ostracized or condemned for it. Once one is a member, he has a certain security within the group. However, the general tone of the fraternity prescribes playing down the time and effort required for academic excellence. It is all right to get good grades, but not to appear greedy for them, boast of them, or sacrifice friendliness or loyalty in pursuit of them.

The nine "non-inheritors" in our interview sample fell into two groups. The first group of six consisted of sons of small-town public school administrators and successful men in West Coast suburbs who lacked college educations. The other three were at the university on scholarships, came from low-income households, were not of Anglo-Saxon descent, and had been forced to cope with the problems of serious illness or domestic difficulties. These three were among the hardest-working students on campus. Prior to college, most of the "non-inheritors" had enjoyed active and flattering social lives and the adulation that accompanies success in high-school athletic endeavors. Because their scholarships covered tuition and little else, most of them worked at part-time jobs to pay for their other expenses. Most "non-inheritors" had two other burdens as well. One was that they were involved in a dramatic separation process from their own families. The closer they moved in their social activities toward an acceptance of upper-middle-class suburban values and patterns, and toward professional life, the further they removed themselves from the values and way of life of their former friends and family. During college, some of these men found themselves in a social no-man's land. It was no longer possible psychologically for them to return to the ways of their parents, but they had not yet grasped the nuances and subtleties of upper-middle-class social life. As a result, they were often depressed. They rarely dated Stanford coeds until their senior year at college, and their pride prevented them from exposing themselves to situations in which they would appear gauche. On the other hand, their relationships with women who were less well-educated and socially self-confident no longer satisfied them. To add to their difficulties their high schools had generally not prepared them for college with the same skill and proficiency with which the upper-middle-class suburban high schools or prep schools had prepared the "inheritors," and as a result, many of the "non-inheritors" had a much harder time academically than their fraternity peers did. Providing for their financial needs, competing academically in spite of inadequate preparation, adapting to a new set of social patterns and values, and contending with the emotional pain involved in separation from their former environments were sources of stress for these men. At the end of four years, most of the "non-inheritors" in our study complained of feeling exhausted and depleted. Some of these men described feelings of depression; others, difficulty in controlling their anger. However, most of them were well on their way to higher socioeconomic status and an enriched awareness of intellectual and cultural matters.

The cost of upward mobility seemed to increase in relation to the number of steps up the social ladder to be made by the students. For example, one of the "non-inheritors," whose father lacked college training, had grown up in an upper-middle-class suburb and had enjoyed a social life at home comparable to that of the "inheritors." He was under less strain than most of the other "non-inheritors." By contrast, the son of a Spanish-American construction foreman, who had been educated at a small Catholic school, and whose moral and religious values were challenged by his contact with the questioning attitude he found in the university, experienced much pain in his upward progress.

Students from blue-collar families and those of foreign parentage were a small minority within most of the fraternities, but their presence gave the fraternity men an opportunity to know at least one or two individuals from very different backgrounds who were attempting to achieve upper-middle-class status. Each fraternity had one or two members of minority groups. These exceptions did not noticeably disturb the homogeneity of the fraternities, for two reasons. First, their number was very small; and second, minority-group members pledged by fraternities appeared to have somewhat the same qualities that distinguished the fraternity men in general—self-confidence in social matters, attractive appearance, physical energy, and good physical coordination.

In addition to differences in autonomy and socioeconomic status within each fraternity, there usually appeared to be a wide difference in orientation. Some members were very much interested in campus activities; some were primarily interested in getting good grades; others were distinguished by being favorite escorts in the "deb" circuits. Some members were recognized as hard drinkers, and were capable of wild, destructive behavior; while others were interested in intellectual matters. Although almost all these types were represented within each fraternity, some fraternities had a preponderance of one or two types of individuals. Two extreme groups will serve as illustrations. One was described as a "straight-arrow house." Here the men were apt to be churchgoers; to limit their drinking; to be interested in achieving good grades; and to prefer masculine company, with occasional forays into the world of women. At the opposite extreme was a house of the sort known as a "wild-animal house," in which the members seemed to try to outdo one another in exploits of heavy drinking, and freely showed contempt for students interested in esthetic, artistic, or political matters. They delighted in aggressive behavior toward women and in dangerous or destructive activities. The truth of the claim of the fraternity men that there is diversity within the fraternity lies in the fact that men do join fraternities from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, aspire to a variety of careers and occupations, and exhibit a variety of behavior styles and values.

Interviews over the four years with twenty-two fraternity men indicated some of the areas where the fraternity system, as it existed, impeded the personal development of the members and encouraged resistance to the intellectual and cultural values of the university. Some of the students found the continuous round of social and athletic events burdensome. For others, socializing provided a tempting escape from the discouraging task of academic competition. Simulating lightheartedness—adopting a "hang-loose" attitude—was less disturbing to their self-esteem than admitting their inability to compete successfully. Gregariousness within the fraternity often encouraged superficiality in relationships and values and a blunting of perceptions. In the interest of group solidarity, fraternity men were expected to act in a friendly and loyal way toward the 40 to 60 others with whom they had daily association. To maintain good-natured acceptance of a large number of individuals with varying patterns of behavior requires self-discipline, and some students experienced considerable strain as a result of inhibiting their critical or hostile reactions. Provisions existed within the fraternity way of life for relief of tensions through athletics, heavy drinking, and pranks. Outbursts against a brother for tabooed behavior occasionally occurred, but a more frequent displacement of aggressive feelings was made through disparaging remarks and occasional attacks on those in the "outgroups."

Although the majority of the fraternity men in our interview sample never or rarely participated in antisocial behavior, they often acquiesced by non-interference. The interviewees whose behavior had been most aggressive were students with considerable anxiety about survival in the university community. These students experienced difficulty in controlling their impulses; often their fate at the university appeared to them to presage rejection by their homes and communities. The puppy-like exuberance of a group of vigorous males looking for fun would often stimulate them to overstep the limits of appropriate behavior. Discussing such behavior, one "non-inheritor" remarked: "I enjoy going to fraternity parties. You could say that this is for letting off steam, as well as for gaining experience in what parties are like. Our parties aren't wild to the point of maliciousness—there isn't as much destructiveness in our fraternity as in others. I have destructive problems to deal with about once a month [he was president of his fraternity]. Gross behavior with girls isn't much of a problem in our House. We have our parties and date girls and get our pleasures, but we don't make a big thing out of what is called 'grossing' a girl—people in our fraternity agree that this is childish." An "inheritor" had this to say: "I don't like to get raucous and out of hand at parties. I don't like to make a fool out of myself. Destructiveness turns me off. So does obtrusiveness. The trouble with the two Houses nearby that I consider 'animal houses' is just this. We had $1,500 damage done to us this year—BB guns were shot through our windows twice; somebody threw a tire pump through the window; exotic plants were uprooted; skis were stolen and destroyed. This is unforgivable. I would like to see these guys sent to the penitentiary. I don't care if the guy is a straight 'A' student and has the world's greatest girl friend—I don't give a damn. I'd like to send him up."

Another student described a not unusual fraternity phenomenon that defies common concepts of manners and includes a waste of time and money. A graduate student living in one House had expressed contempt for some of the brothers, and they felt that he should be paid back for it: "We had a food fight in his honor—we put him against a door and just smashed food at him. We don't have food fights too often—just every now and then, when it's appropriate. This guy had said that he was amazed at some of the things we did—that they clashed with his idea of society." One can only speculate why intelligent young men from privileged backgrounds and with potentialities for success would need to actively or passively engage in such violent inhibitional releases. Speculation is necessary, because capacity for thoughtful introspection and communication about complicated motivations was not one of the characteristics of most of the fraternity men we interviewed. Some of them learned this complicated skill gradually throughout their college years, first by discussing values with their men friends, and later by trying to explain their feelings to their women friends. At first, many of our students resisted discussing motivations, or openly indicated that they disliked the process of analyzing their behavior or that of others.

One factor in wasteful behavior may be a permissive attitude on the part of parents, some women friends, and even some university authorities. Pranks that go beyond reason may reflect feelings of anxiety over inadequacies, and the tendency to "act out" rather than "think through" periods of discomfort and lowered self-esteem. The traditions of the "Wild West," and the men's physical energy may also play a part. Rebelliousness may be another factor. The men in our sample came primarily from ambitious, hard-working, sometimes fundamentalist families, and they anticipated leading responsible and circumspect lives. College provided them with a brief interlude free from feminine restraints and adult responsibilities. Some students seemed to want to collect and store away incidents of gaiety and abandon for future remembrance.

The fraternity men were more interested in quickly establishing homes of their own than the non-fraternity men were. Whereas all the fraternity men hoped to be married by age 28, 11 per cent to 14 per cent of the men in other groups did not expect to be married by that time. When asked about fourteen important postgraduate values, the fraternity men rated "future family" and "love and affection" as among the first three most important factors more frequently than the other men did. It is as if these men, having conformed to familial demands in the past, and expecting to accept responsibilities as heads of households and community leaders in the future, were seizing at college a fleeting opportunity to rebel against care of property and concern for community approval.

The self-esteem of many of the fraternity men proved to be higher upon entrance into college than that of men in the other groups. They had been the heroes of an earlier stage in adolescence. Some of them had an elitist self-image because of their physical prowess and good looks. In addition, some felt their own superiority enhanced by the affluence and social position of their families. A socially ambitious "non-inheritor" from a wealthy family commented: "I could admittedly lead a terribly double-faced life—what I do and what I want somebody else to do are not at all the same. Anything I'm involved in, I can condone." (A friend of his, to whom we sent a questionnaire, commented: "He tends to be overcritical of people who don't look 'cool,' and overimpressed by those who do. Perhaps one could say he is a conformist, determined to be in the 'ingroup' whatever the cost to values.") At another time, the student said: "My parents want me to get good grades, but they would rather see me having a good time and not getting good grades than getting all A's and not enjoying myself. They keep impressing on me that these are the most 'fun' years, and that I should mix—and that half of college is who you meet and how you get along with people."

Although many of the fraternity men may have entered the university with high self-esteem based on a feeling of natural superiority, two elements in the university environment, the faculty and some women students, tended to discount wealth, good looks, and athletic prowess. The faculty admired and rewarded skills in abstract thinking and communication, and men in other groups appeared to excel in these areas. The practice of admitting two to three times as many men as women brought into the university community women students who were often superior to the men in areas of academic and social competence. They were in a favorable position in regard to the laws of supply and demand, and frequently made it clear that they wanted men who were not only outgoing and fun-loving, but also intellectual enough to discuss ideas, esthetic enough to share cultural interests, and introspective enough to discuss and understand their own personalities and those of the girls. Some of the fraternity men found themselves working harder than formerly at academic tasks and getting less recognition, and at the same time, having difficulty obtaining feminine approval. Thus, their feelings of adequacy as men and their feelings of self-respect as achievers were challenged by the university environment. Some men had the resources to develop the new skills valued by the university environment, but others only became more anxious and reacted by acting-out. Some of them bolstered their self-esteem by depreciating other people, including those who appeared to them to be less manly, less physically courageous, and less loyal to traditional leaders and ways of doing things than they themselves were. A few students escaped into hard drinking, destruction of property, fast driving, or sexual exploits, all of which they exhibited for the amusement or attention of other fraternity men. Frequently, these poorly adapted men failed to survive at the university, but their activities served to provide ammunition for those who had borne the brunt of the fraternity men's elitist attitude, or who envied them their solidity and ability to enjoy leisure pursuits.

Some fraternity members expressed strong aggressive feelings toward students who dressed unconventionally or took liberal or radical stands. The more violent expressions appeared to come from students who were having a great struggle controlling their impulses in general. One "inheritor" remarked: "The people who are banning fall-out shelters are asinine. People who wear 'Peace' on their lapels are the dregs of society. They think they are 'cool'; they think they are modern; they think they are beatnik. I don't want to know them. Fall-out shelters on campus were thought out seriously by the University." This student did not survive at Stanford. Neither did one of the others, who said with regard to the peace-button wearers: "This brings to mind the business that is going on in Berkeley. I think every one of those guys should be kicked out of school. I think education is not a right, but a privilege. Students ought to be able to get the education they came for. I think the administration at Berkeley didn't know what they were doing [in dealing leniently with protestors]. The students weren't in the right, but the University kind of kissed it off." It should be remembered that these comments came from men who were failing to adjust to college life. An "inheritor" who barely survived the academic competition commented: "I think the Free Speech Movement is disgusting. I don't mind sit-ins, walk-ins, strike-ins—I would do it myself. But when it interferes with the lives of other people, there is recourse to law and it should be used. Anyone who takes the law into his own hands is creating havoc."

Most of the fraternity men we interviewed were conservative, but attempted to be tolerant in their opinions and controlled in their behavior. They indicated an openness to new and liberal ideas if presented to them in a rational and convincing manner. Because of their respect for authority and their reliance on interpersonal contacts rather than on reading and introspection, they were influenced by professorial comments. Many of the fraternity men indicated that the four years of college led to important changes and taught them to be more liberal. Higher scores on scales of psychological tests dealing with social maturity and developmental status, and lower scores on the Ethnocentrism and Authoritarianism scales seem to confirm their self-evaluation. Nevertheless, few of them felt obliged to restrain the minority of fraternity members who tended to "scapegoat" liberal or unconventionally dressed individuals. Possibly the tendency toward uncritical acceptance of the behavior of others within the "in-group" and their own latent hostilities toward less traditional individuals prevented them from helping the more hostile brothers control their aggressive feelings.

These same factors may have prevented them from interfering in incidents of offensive behavior toward women. The men's ambivalent attitude toward women evidenced itself in many ways. The main interest of the men, especially early in their college careers, appeared to be in establishing themselves as accepted members of a male group. They tended to view women partly as potential sources of restraint and partly as "trophies"—proofs of their attractiveness and manliness. Women were admired if they were pretty, fun-loving, and non-judgmental. Later in their development, some of the men, through the efforts of specific women, became more comfortable with their masculinity and with their women friends' femininity, and were able to enjoy intimate and close relationships based on mutual acceptance as individuals. For others of the men, difficulty in getting dates, overt disapproval by women of their aggressive behavior, and impersonal treatment led to resentment. These men reacted by engaging in derogatory gossip about women students. They viewed at a distance and discussed as sexual objects the women whom they were not able to date, or they boasted about actual or imagined exploits with those they did date. Occasionally the unpleasant phenomenon of "grossing" a girl took place. This infrequent occurrence, which involved treating apparently masochistic or intoxicated girls in a dehumanizing or degrading fashion, was apparently indulged in by the participants in order to show their willingness to degrade women and themselves.

Drinking appeared to be a frequent activity among Stanford men, and Stanford fraternity and off-campus men described themselves as getting drunk more frequently than the men in the dorms and eating clubs did. Some students said they drank to "get high," to relax, or to add enjoyment to dates and special occasions. Others found in it a way of relieving tensions and coping with bad moods. Interviewees and other informants indicated that they were less involved in exhibitionistic drinking in their senior year than during the first two years of college. For some men in all fraternities, drinking was an activity integrated into their personalities. Some of them enjoyed a beer or two "with the boys" and a couple of drinks at parties; and some were heavy but controlled drinkers. Although the fraternity culture encouraged drinking, students who did not care to drink heavily were free to follow their own value systems. There even existed small clusters of abstainers. A woman student, in commenting about her fiance's choice of fraternity, said: "John's first choice of fraternity wouldn't take him because he doesn't drink. We think it's silly to have something to drink when you don't enjoy it. John explained this to another fraternity that interested him, and they kept inviting him back, and he joined. It has worked out well. There are a few others in the fraternity who don't drink." Another student was an occasional drinker. When he joined his fraternity, he felt that there was no pressure on him to drink. He enjoyed a drink or two at a party, but otherwise abstained. By his junior year, he felt that his fraternity brothers would "notice" if he didn't have an occasional beer after studying, and had no reluctance in complying with this pressure. However, when they demanded, on the occasion of his twenty-first birthday that he down twenty-one beers at a sitting, he rebelled: "A couple of times I've drunk too much beer, but never that much. If I feel like doing it, I'll do it. But I'm not just going to do it because I have to."

For other students, drinking was an escape or necessity. One student remarked: "I drink because I enjoy it. I've never gotten so drunk that I couldn't control myself. I have never had to be driven home. I remember being depressed about a girl, or school, and going out and tying a good one on. Generally, it loses its attraction once you start drinking—at least it does for me." Although this man seems to have been able to cope with his desire to "drink and forget," another was not so well controlled. His background included family and academic problems, as well as the fear of becoming an alcoholic. He noted that whenever he was displeased with something, he got "smashed." He had had two accidents while driving, and knew that he drank too much. In discussing excessive drinking, he commented: "The problem stems mostly from fellows just seeking an escape. It's a question of how disturbed you are. A lot of people, if they work for something and then don't quite get it, get very disturbed—it takes time for something like that to wear off. When you get smashed, the feelings don't wear off, but your interests change and you don't think about it."

TABLE 46

DRINKING PATTERNS OF MEN STUDENTS
(IN PER CENT)

	Off-Campus (N = 44)	*Frat/On* (N = 69)	*Frat/Off* (N = 44)	*Eating Club* (N = 37)	*Dorm* (N = 42)
Beer "frequently"[a]	68	64	68	32	26
Wine "frequently"	27	11	14	6	5
Hard liquor "frequently"	39	28	36	16	10
Beer "never"	7	4	2	11	26
Wine "never"	11	10	0	5	29
Hard liquor "never"	16	6	5	3	40

[a] "Frequently" was defined as daily or once or twice weekly. Differences between residential groups regarding consumption of each of the alcoholic beverages are significant beyond the .001 level. Omitted are per cents of students indicating that they drank specific beverages occasionally.

Whether they drank lightly or heavily, most of the fraternity men did not consider drinking a problem. However, if a person were in danger of becoming a problem drinker, the pressure of fraternity life for frequent masculine conviviality, the easy availability of liquor, and the round of parties and dates provide more than the usual opportunity for him to overindulge.

Although fraternity life creates definite problems for its participants, we found that it also facilitates some of the developmental tasks of the students. The information obtained from our twenty-two interviewees led us to infer that their fraternity participation may have aided them in the separation process by helping them to make the transition from home living. In contrast to the impersonal environment of the freshman dorm, the fraternity house offers the students a sense of belonging to an ingroup, a feeling of security, and a housing arrangement that affords more continuity with their previous experiences than the dormitory does. The functional aspects of the fraternities appeared to these students to provide a continuity of experience in group activities, and to be helpful in enabling them to move emotionally from their home community to the university community. The comments of a student from a small town summarize the reasons given by many other students for joining a fraternity: "I joined a fraternity mainly because it's a chance to get to know more people better. In the dorms, I went around with a clique; there doesn't seem to be the great desire to get out and build friendships that there is in a fraternity. My two close friends joined the fraternity with me. They're interested in someone else and not themselves all the time. They like to have a good time, and they're interested in school, too."

Many future fraternity men react to the universal freshman dormitory experience by quickly becoming part of an informal, friendly clique; by assuming positions such as social chairman or athletic chairman for their house in the dormitory; and by trying to get dates in spite of the difficulties freshman men have in dating Stanford girls. By the time of "rush," most fraternity men in our study had spent considerable time finding friends who enjoyed athletics, camaraderie, dating, or drinking. Their behavior in the dormitories prior to rushing and their behavior during the rushing experience indicated that they wanted the advantages of being part of a well-defined group, and that they were willing to pay a price for this opportunity. They were willing to redirect some of their aggressive and individualistic tendencies in ways prescribed by the fraternity. In many houses, special opportunities were provided for the new brothers to get to know a number of men well. Fraternity living also provided opportunities for them to get to know upperclassmen and thus "learn the ropes."

Earlier we discussed some of the problems arising out of a lack of critical attitude among fraternity members. There is another side to that coin. When the individual fraternity member contracted to be friendly and loyal to his "brothers," he could expect this to be reciprocated. This sort of arrangement sometimes provided protective insurance against factors in the university environment that tended to make students feel insecure and unworthy. Although relationships between fraternity men were often more reserved than intimate, they did give a certain sense of security. With the exception of those who were moving rapidly up or down the social ladder, fraternity men rarely complained of feelings of alienation or diffusion. This may have been because they experimented so infrequently with new ideas or new experiences. The security and group identity provided by the fraternity may have provided a support for their self-esteem that enabled them to proceed with their educational tasks. Dr. Helene Deutsch speaks of group participation among younger adolescents as providing an opportunity for peer-approved regressive behavior in the service of slowing growth, so that disintegration can be avoided and progress eventually abetted.[2] Thus, even some of the regressive aspects of fraternity living may have functional value for students who need relief from the anxiety of moving too rapidly toward independence, or who are unready for heterosexual mutuality, or for confrontation with differences of values, ideas, and behavior in their classmates.

The task of relating to women in a voluntary and independent way is one that causes considerable anxiety for men students. Among the students in our samples, this was true even for men who had much experience in dating during high school. Asking for dates and venturing toward physical contact was an anxiety-laden experience for many of these men. Such movement is fraught with potentialities for confrontation with ambivalent feelings, mutual dependency, and commitment, and therefore for rejection and lowered self-esteem. As we have indicated, the self-esteem of most freshman and sophomore students is not very sturdy. With the support of fraternity brothers and the aid of planned social events, the task of making arrangements for social life with girls was facilitated. In light of the men's fear of rejection and actual experiences of rejection, some of their less desirable behavior toward women becomes more understandable. But in spite of their anxieties, most of the men were successful in moving away from isolation or exclusively same-sex relationships toward comfortable and pleasant group activities or casual relationships with women. Other men were able to move toward closer and more mature relationships.

---

[2] Deutsch, Helene. Monograph in preparation. Paper presented on November 6, 1966, in San Francisco, under the auspices of the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute.

Another advantage the fraternity provided was the opportunity for non-competitive or mildly competitive physical activities. The fraternity men, more than others, appeared to be physically vigorous and energetic. College athletics are too time-consuming or too competitive for many students, and the informal and easily available athletic activities connected with the fraternities provide an important outlet. The fraternity is one of the few institutions on campus that seriously concerns itself with the need of young people for fun and relaxation. This is important, in light of the many demands made of students to question their values and goals and to compete in a demanding academic and social environment.

Descriptions of life within the fraternities provided some of the few examples given by men of commitment and helpfulness to others. By joining a fraternity, these men had indicated a willingness to be depended upon and to depend upon others. The fraternity man was expected to offer and to receive friendliness and helpfulness. Because of continuity and propinquity, a fraternity man had the opportunity to perceive pain and pleasure in a variety of other persons, and to have his own pain and pleasure perceived by them. When illness or some other mishap occurred to a fraternity man, he could count on help from his brothers. Most fraternity houses provided study tables to aid students who were failing; one acceptable excuse for non-participation in group activities was academic failure or problems. One student, in commenting on the help he got from fraternity brothers, noted: "They help me out as far as grades go. We just kind of made an agreement—I told them that my grades had to come first, and they agreed, and are doing all they can to help me. I think this will help a lot too, because now I get all my English papers graded once before I turn them in and then I rewrite them. They help me with my math and anything that I have problems with. In general, I can go to the House and find an expert in just about anything." This student had come to the university from a small town, and had encountered many problems in adjusting to the more sophisticated and intellectual college milieu. In addition, his athletic scholarship required long hours of practice. He attributed his survival at the university to the comfort and help he received from his fraternity brothers. (In common with some other athletes and fraternity men, he expressed feelings resembling those of being persecuted when he described the way he experienced criticism of athletes and fraternity men.)

Another functional aspect of the fraternity is that it offers informal training in leadership. We found individual fraternity members who aspired to varying levels and types of leadership. These students did not want lives detached from other people, and they did not necessarily need to restrict their friendships to one or two close friends. They wanted, and appeared to be able to accept, a variety of encounters every day and many times a day; and they seemed able to play as well as work with the people around them. They aspired to more-than-casual contact with many individuals and groups throughout their lives, and accepted the fact that such aspirations involve the mastering of complex skills. The fraternities seem to have tried to cope with the complexity of teaching these skills by developing certain rituals and definitions of appropriate behavior, and by offering opportunities for taking on tasks involving varying degrees of leadership. Innumerable comments made by fraternity men indicated either a willingness or a desire to lead others, or respect for "brothers" whom they considered leaders.

In every fraternity, the necessity for cooperation in managing the household and planning social and athletic events requires the assistance of all the members at various times. Participation in such activities gave our students an opportunity to learn how much responsibility they were willing and able to take for group activities, and what some of the costs and rewards of leadership were. Experience in enlisting cooperation and loyalty and in avoiding group tensions were valuable training experiences for those students who were interested in management or politics.

What of those male students who, either through chance or election, did not join fraternities? This segment of the male student population was divided into those who joined eating clubs, and those unaffiliated men who lived either in dormitories or in off-campus apartments. These men differed in their attitudes toward group membership and autonomy. The fraternity men, with their interest in leading and manipulating others, were willing to adapt to group demands and to rely on the group for status and support. Often their needs and preferences as individuals were subordinated to group patterns. Eating-club men described themselves as more individualistic and less socially sophisticated than fraternity men. However, belonging to a personally selected and formally organized group of men appealed to them, and may have represented an effort on their part to move toward more active participation with peer groups than they had enjoyed in high school. The dormitory men, with their shyness and emotional investment in themselves as workers, appeared to desire minimal response from other men, individually or in groups. The off-campus men appeared to choose a few people as close friends, and to avoid living with large groups of men—either because of their desire for independence, or because they were perceived by others as not easily adaptable to group living.

An "eating club" is an organization composed of a group of from 30 to 60 men who live either in off-campus apartments or in dormitories that do not provide meals. As their name indicates, eating clubs provide facilities for a congenial group of men to meet for meals. In addition, they provide for social, athletic, cultural, and service activities. Although eating clubs have existed on the Stanford campus for about sixty years, only in the last fifteen years have they had permanent housing—a one-story L-shaped building that contains kitchens and all-purpose dining rooms. Together the clubs share an athletic field, picnic grounds, and a common game room. The clubs are open 24 hours a day, and provide a place for studying, goofing off, and "raiding the icebox." They are far from glamorous in appearance, but are functional and easy to maintain. The clubs boast a diversity of membership. One club, with a large proportion of members interested in drama, art, and creative writing, could be described as having an atmosphere of great casualness. There are about a third as many eating clubs at Stanford as there are fraternities, and they have about a third as many members.

The men in our interview sample who joined eating clubs often came from modest backgrounds, and they lacked the self-confidence in social matters that characterized the fraternity men. A number of them had been "good boys" during high school, occupied with academic challenges and less involved or skilled in athletic and group activities than the fraternity men were. Having felt themselves part of a small, intellectual minority during high school, they looked forward to a more active social life at college, where they anticipated finding a larger number of students with their own values and interests.

The freshman year proved to be a great disappointment to these men, and the process of separation from home was made more difficult by their discouragement with regard to social life at the university. Three groups in the freshman dormitories contributed to this feeling. First there was a small but active group of students whose pranksterism and anti-intellectual attitudes served to dampen any tendency on the part of others to exhibit an interest in intellectual or cultural matters. Second, there were the potential fraternity members, who were locating each other and grouping together in anticipation of the rushing experience. They tended to exclude students who did not make a "cool" impression, because they were reluctant to be thought of as the friends of those who would not be pledged. Third, there were the students who were isolated or "booked" all the time. The problem of exhaustive academic demands and the danger of low grades further dampened the hopes of the eating-club men for a pleasant social life. In answering the Senior Questionnaire, almost half the eating-club men said they had been very dissatisfied with themselves as freshmen, and that this was largely because of their disappointment with the social milieu. By their senior year, the social environment seemed more in harmony with their high-school expectations, and they had adapted well to academic demands. In many cases, for many of them, their experiences at the university began poorly, but ended happily.[3]

---

[3] Forty-six per cent of the club men described themselves as being "quite" or "very" dissatisfied with themselves as freshmen, whereas 24 per cent of them so described themselves as seniors. Of the five subgroups—fraternity men living on campus, fraternity men living off campus, eating club men, dormitory men, and non-fraternity off-campus men—they had been the most dissatisfied as freshmen and least dissatisfied as seniors.

The nine club men in our interview sample appeared to be more different from one another than the fraternity men were. There were three thoughtful small-town students who had been outstanding for academic skills and leadership in small-town communities. They appeared to be more intellectual, less athletic, and less social than the fraternity men who had come from small communities. Perception of the superiority of students educated in urban, suburban, or "prep" schools was described by one of the three in this way: "In high school I was a big man. I kind of came here with the thought that there would be no problem in college and that I had a pretty good background. When I got here, I found that that wasn't true. From the first, I ran into people who had definite ideas about politics and I hardly knew who they were talking about. It didn't seem as if I knew very much. Mainly I realized how much I had missed by coming from a small community."

Three of the nine students had grown up in large communities and came from families with strong ethical convictions. Two of these families were from minority groups.[4] The majority of the eating-club men in our interview sample viewed both parents as individuals with strengths and weaknesses, and attempted to understand them as they were attempting to understand themselves. Sometimes this involved confrontations and conflicts leading to greater understanding. The mothers of these men appeared to be active in professions or community affairs, and to communicate freely with their sons. The remaining three students had eccentricities and problems that made it difficult for them to adapt to group demands, but they found certain benefits in the easygoing environment of the clubs. For example, one student with professional aspirations joined a club partly out of awareness of his ineptitude in dealing with people; he hoped to gain more skills in this area through his club associations.

The clubmen typically lacked the social self-confidence of the fraternity men. Many of them had been interested in academic matters and good citizenship in high school and had been among the students who delighted teachers and adults with their interest in the problems of the adult world. A graduate student informant summarized some of the outstanding qualities of the clubmen as follows: "In eating clubs, you get compliant, nice, small-town, easygoing, not-too-talkative boys. If you get to know them, you find they're interesting. A familiar quality of the men is quietness. These guys don't go out of their way to slap you on the back, but they do have opinions. A lot of these guys were tops in high school: top athlete and top leader. They got here, and they had difficulties when they were freshmen—they weren't socially oriented. They don't date much.[5] They get into clubs, but they don't get active on the campus. When they do, they get involved with the radio station or the drama groups."

---

[4] Another student could be described as having "minority status," in the sense of the uniqueness of his being from a family with high-income status and a history of many generations of intellectual and social prestige. He chose to remain "out" of the fraternity culture, and disdained many of its values as materialistic and anti-intellectual.

The quality of professionalism was more evident in our interview sample of clubmen than in the fraternity group. Of our nine students, the majority came from homes where the fathers were professional men who practiced their professions and were recognized for specific competencies based on education; usually they were not in managerial or leadership positions per se. Three were lawyers, two were teachers, one was an artist, the seventh was a physician interested in teaching and research, the eighth a small businessman, and the ninth, a white-collar worker with a Master's degree. Four of the mothers were employed part-time or full-time as teachers; one was a social worker, and another a bookkeeper. Of the nine clubmen, four wanted to be physicians, and three of these were interested in research or teaching. Two aspired to be writers, and another to be a psychologist—and these three also included university teaching as a possibility. Of the two eating-club men who were atypical of the interview group, one aspired to business administration and the other to engineering.

Our interview sample (N = 7) differed from the questionnaire sample (N = 37) in its greater representation of premedical students and smaller representation of business and engineering students. In a follow-up study indicating the graduate school the students are attending, the eating-club men had a large number of students in business, engineering, and fields that generally lead to college teaching or research. The large number of students preparing for business and engineering as well as for possible academic careers suggests the existence of considerable diversity in the eating clubs. (The absence of students entering law may be connected with the "quietness" suggested earlier as a characteristic of the eating-club men: see Table 44.)

---

[5] We interviewed the students intensively about interpersonal and sexual relationships at the end of the junior year. Of the forty-two men in our interview sample, none of the dormitory men and about a third of the "inheritor" fraternity men and the eating-club men had had sexual relations. About two-thirds of the "non-inheritors" and the men who lived in off-campus apartments had had sexual relations.

Many of the clubmen lacked the "coolness," that is, the smooth, outgoing, apparent self-confidence, that characterized many of the fraternity men. The clubmen had not belonged to the most popular crowds in high school, although some had held formal student offices. They were not like the white Protestant males from upper-middle-class suburbs we described as the pacesetters for the fraternities, although they may have had one or more of these characteristics. The fraternity men appeared to some of the clubmen like college models for magazine ads, and the girls they were seen with seemed attractive and superficially desirable. Many of the clubmen felt inferior to the able and attractive men in the fraternity groups, and envied them their group solidarity, manliness, and ability to have fun. Although moving toward masculine gregariousness and fun, the clubmen often were far from carefree. In other ways, the clubmen felt indifferent or superior to the fraternity men, whom they perceived as lacking idealism and understanding of themselves and the world.

A few words about some of the clubmen in our interview sample may serve to illustrate their lack of "coolness." Three of them were serious premedical students with interests either in research or in serving others directly. They yearned for more social grace and ease than they felt they possessed. Two of the three were from minority groups, and suffered from self-consciousness in this regard. Two others were potential creative writers, and shared a detached and watchful attitude toward everything they experienced. They were sharp observers, skilled in translating into words the impressions they received. The appearance of the first three men was overly neat and conventional for the campus, whereas the second two dressed carelessly, even unconventionally.

Their hair was a little long, and one of the students, the son of a distinguished and wealthy family, usually wore clean but shabby jeans and tennis shoes. The other potential writer was from a small town, and lacked urbanity and sophistication. Possibly because of a lack of interest, or of finances, or of the knowledge of what was most fashionable and attractive, these men were not as well-groomed as the fraternity men. One serious and long-haired student from a minority group was deeply involved in applying his elementary knowledge of depth psychology to understanding his own motivations and those of people around him. Another clubman, a Negro, had not made a good social adjustment in his own home community, and appeared to be bewildered by the college environment.

In general, the clubmen appeared to be more introspective than most of the fraternity and dormitory men. They showed more facility in discussing their behavior and relationships with others and their opinions about the validity of ideals and philosophies. The writers-to-be, the psychologist-to-be, and two of the potential doctors were intensely involved in trying to understand and evaluate what they experienced, and to develop their own personal philosophies. They were concerned about questions of integrity and individual responsibility. They often were critical of the adult world, but were not rebellious. They took seriously their responsibility to determine their own values. Their relationships with other students involved discussions of personal problems and clarification of values and feelings. Although career interests and graduate school were important to them, they were also involved with the world of ideas. In spite of their academic and career interests, the clubmen were more outgoing than the dormitory men, and were more interested in a variety of relationships with others.

A large proportion of the eating-club men in our interview sample had felt "different" prior to college, because they had adhered to adult-approved behavior while many of their high school peers behaved in a more peer-approved way. Most of the clubmen had been serious, hard-working, future-oriented, controlled students; but in contrast to the dormitory men, they now had more desire for fun and popularity. Looking back on his college years, one clubman commented: "Until recently, 'doing my duty' and 'being a good boy' were my main goals. Although I still want to be a competent doctor and do significant research, I also want to go to parties, drink with my friends, and have some fun while at college. As a result of getting to know more friends, I feel that I have moved from being self-centered to being more interested in others. I am less enthusiastic about knowledge for the sake of knowledge alone; I have moved toward wanting to work with people and do something for them." This student was an unusually competent person interested in medical teaching or research. He was aware that his relationships with others were characterized by formality and distance, and commented that absence of conflict with others might reflect his reluctance to risk intimacy.

The tendency to value intellectual gratifications more highly than emotional relationships was suggested by the students' answers regarding activities and interests they considered of importance after graduation. The fraternity men were more interested in careers than the clubmen were; twice as many clubmen, dormitory men, and off-campus men expected intellectual and artistic matters to be of primary importance. Almost twice as many fraternity men as clubmen expected activities with their future families to be of major importance. The latter showed considerable interest in helping others, but, as one student suggested, they seemed more inclined to love "mankind" than to love "men."

The self-evaluation of the students in our samples and the results of psychological test scores seem to indicate that the students in the eating clubs were relatively open to change as a result of the college experience. More than students in the other subgroups, the clubmen described themselves as having changed regarding moral, political, and religious values, and as having enhanced their academic skills and intellectual interests. They may have found enough pleasing factors in the university environment to provide gratifications, yet sufficient displeasing aspects to stimulate independent and critical thinking; or they may have come to this specific university because of a readiness to change in the direction of greater social sophistication or increased intellectual interests. Then, too, their capacity for introspection and communication may have enabled them to utilize relationships in the service of personal modification. When asked about the reasons for changes that occurred, the clubmen indicated ten out of a possible sixteen reasons with greater frequency than men in the other housing groups did. More clubmen indicated emotional readjustments connected with their homes as being factors of importance. Our interview data indicate some reasons why being away from home may have had the importance it did for some of these men. Many of them had ventured far from home either geographically, or in cultural patterns, or both. Our interview sample included a Boston Brahmin, several students from New York City, several students from small towns, a Negro student, a Japanese student, and two Jewish students. For many of these students, living among a population of predominantly white, Protestant suburbanites, in a Western atmosphere, stimulated them to evaluate their familiar values from a different point of view. More clubmen than others indicated problems in their families as reasons for changes that had occurred. This may have indicated either more family problems or greater interest and perception on the part of the students. Table 47 suggests many interesting variations in the perceptions of men in the different housing-affiliation groups. Many of the clubmen had enjoyed closer relationships with other men during college than they had previously experienced. They spoke with enthusiasm, as the men in other housing groups did, of long, serious discussion dealing with religion, politics, and morality. However, they, more than men in other housing affiliation groups, indicated that changes had occurred in these areas. Change was perceived by them as being most noticeable in the area of moral values. This is in harmony with the impression given by our interviewees that a segment of the clubmen had been "good boys" in high school, and were eager to become more venturesome and independent as they moved into young adulthood.

The eating-club members we interviewed indicated to us some of the advantages and disadvantages of the clubs. Like the fraternities, the clubs provided a group that was small enough for closeness, yet large enough for diversity, and which promised continuity for several years. Moreover, the clubs offered group activities for students who were more social and athletic than the dormitory students, but less self-confident and experienced in

Table 47

STUDENT SELF-EVALUATION OF CAUSES OF CHANGE DURING COLLEGE (PER CENT WHO SAID THE FOLLOWING HAD "GREAT INFLUENCE" DURING COLLEGE)

	Eating Club (N = 37)	*Frat/On* (N = 69)	*Frat/Off* (N = 44)	*Off-Campus* (N = 44)	*Dorm* (N = 42)	*p*
Factors within self						
Problems in self	51	45	45	45	50	NS
Gaining self-understanding	65	58	45	55	45	NS
Peers						
Closeness to opposite sex peers	43	43	57	39	21	*
Closeness to same sex peers	43	42	34	34	30	NS
Crises in relationships	27	10	20	20	19	$< .10$
Problems in others	30	19	20	20	12	NS
Family						
Being away from home	57	40	18	32	40	**
Problems in own family	24	4	11	11	7	*
Ideational						
Living group	27	61	50	7	21	***
Ideas from teachers and courses	35	20	30	16	26	NS
Ideas in books	24	12	14	23	36	**
Close relations with teachers and adults	16	10	14	14	12	NS
Involvement with social, political improvement	19	9	5	0	14	*

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

these matters than the fraternity men.[6] For young men with limited incomes and many academic responsibilities, it was convenient to have access to inexpensive and regular social activities. "The main advantage of the eating club is, of course, meals and eating together—social life is pretty good. We pay $20 a quarter for social fees, which isn't too high. Every two weeks or so there's a party of some kind to go to. 'Thank God it's Friday' parties are generally stag parties where you drink beer, sing, and talk—sort of an unloosening at the end of the week. In addition, there are dances; and there is always a group that you can go with to the various things around campus—a bunch of boys will get together and go see a movie or something like that. Most of my dating is for club functions." Another student, nostalgic about his hometown crowd, commented: "I enjoy going to parties at the eating club because I like to dance and I enjoy drinking. I like the sense of being with a crowd. But I don't have the sense of being at home —I'm being at the parties without real contact. I say 'hello,' and things like that, but I don't have a meaningful relationship with the people at the party."

There appeared to be greater encouragement of individuality and less emphasis on conformity in the clubs than in the fraternities. One student commented: "I suppose the main thing that I can say about my friends being helpful during college has been presenting different points of view. In the eating club, you get a large number of people together, and consequently you get varying opinions on things. I wasn't just getting an athlete's view all the time, or a scientist's, or something like that. There have been fellows who have been exceptionally able to have insights into my problems and see things that I was overlooking."

Intellectual, cultural, and service activities were regarded with open acceptance and approval by more clubmen than fraternity members. More of the clubmen we interviewed gave time to university service, tutoring underprivileged children, visiting mental hospitals, and so on, than men in the other groups did. Because of their interest in getting good grades for admission to graduate schools, the clubmen were often unable to satisfy their former interests in reading and cultural matters; our interviewees indicated resentment because of lack of time for these activities. In their free time, many of the students in all the groups interviewed felt the need for relaxation, and for relief from exercising control in the interests of achievement and development.

---

[6] See Table 45.

As described by the interview sample, the main disadvantages of eating clubs were as follows: first, the housing arrangements of the eating clubs were not as attractive as those of the fraternity men; second, the position of the eating clubs in the university community was perceived by many of the members as having lower status than the fraternities; third, a "group image" analogous to the "fraternity man" image was lacking among clubmen, and they somehow resented this; fourth, although the eating clubs had a history of many years on campus, they lacked the traditional sense of continuity and cohesion that characterized many of the fraternities; and finally, the conflict between individual independence and group needs resulted in an indifference that showed itself in lack of participation in group activities and lack of responsibility for club affairs. This indifference directs our attention to the interesting question of ingroup solidarity. Some criticisms of fraternities deal with the scapegoating of outsiders, and with the pressures on fraternity members to conform and to participate in fraternity-sponsored affairs. Loyalty to a group appears to involve renunciation of some individual preferences. It would be interesting to try to ascertain the point at which an excess of either individuality or diversity leads to the deterioration of a group.

The next two major student groups we will describe—the dormitory men and the non-fraternity off-campus men—defined themselves by their choice of living arrangements as being either uninterested in or unacceptable to a defined social group. The two groups of men differed dramatically in terms of conventionality and independence. Many of the dormitory men were quite dependent and conventional within a limited circle of relationships. The men who lived in off-campus apartments were often resistant to attempts to limit their freedom to live as they wished. Most of them were in protest against the restrictions of conventionality, and were open to a variety of new experiences. Another group preferred off-campus living because of its economy and relative privacy.

With regard to the off-campus men, there is obviously no clearly defined single milieu in which they existed. Except in a few unusual circumstances, three or four men would move into one of the many apartment houses available in the area, and share the expense and work involved in housekeeping. They cooked, shopped, and lived like members of the non-university community—coming and going as they wished, eating and drinking at will, and spending whatever they could afford. Of the nine off-campus men in our interview sample, two physicists-to-be resembled the dormitory men in their task-orientedness and desire for minimal relations. They had been reasonably content with dormitory living, but had moved to off-campus apartments for reasons of economy, because of friends who made similar decisions, or because of annoyance with dormitory efforts to involve them in social life. "They are trying to turn the dorm into a fraternity," one of them complained.

Three other men gave an impression of "rootlessness." These men appeared to be constantly excited and restless, and had difficulty finding a comfortable place for themselves in the university environment. Their fathers had been well-educated and successful, but the families seemed never to have taken root in their communities. In two instances, the mothers had died during the early adolescence of the sons, and this probably had contributed to the son's confusion. These three had all been "rushed," and one of them had actually joined a fraternity. The son of an international diplomat, he said he would not have considered an "ordinary fraternity," but required one that had "proof of suitable measures of social independence and academic excellence." After three months, he moved out of the fraternity house, maintaining that he liked the house and the men, but didn't like "to get up at nine on Saturday and rake the lawn, fix meals, and so on." He maintained a tangential relationship to the fraternity, as did a second student. They enjoyed attending occasional parties at the fraternities, but felt that beyond that, they did not wish to participate in cooperative efforts or group living. The second student, a Scandinavian, had felt "out of it" in the Italian neighborhood of his high-school days. He deeply resented being classified by others at the university according to where he lived. He had exhausted himself as a freshman in trying to remove the "dorm stigma." [7] He and his roommate chose an old house to live in. They rented their house to on-campus groups for beer parties. This enabled the student to enjoy gratification from arranging for men and women to come together and be congenial—a need of his that had an almost compulsive quality to it.

The third "rootless" student became a heavy drinker. His choice of housing reflected his attitude toward school: "All I have to do with school is going to classes and eating lunch there. Other than that, I live completely out of it." He and his circle of friends were described by an acquaintance as "individuals." "They're all bright; they're all different; somebody from the group is drinking every night." According to another student: "This group achieved almost legendary status for its incredible parties, feats of drinking, sexual promiscuity, and other irresponsible acts. The goal was to seek new thrills and experience—new sensations. However, as in the case of most thrill-seekers, the desire for thrills became an insatiable hunger. As the group slipped more and more into a life without meaning, it became defensively exclusive, barring from its ranks people who wouldn't or couldn't condone its actions. At the same time, the group desperately sought appreciation and acceptance. Their increasing social defaults and increasing rejections began a period of misery from which they couldn't extricate themselves."

The remaining four off-campus men in our sample were energetic and eager. They came from low-income families, and their parents had not had college educations. The men, by virtue of their abilities and energies, were pioneering into a new and exciting world. As freshmen, they appeared self-confident and pleased with the impression that they felt they were making in their new environment. But egocentrism and naïveté led them to evaluate their situation more optimistically than reality warranted. Although most of them would have liked to join organized groups, they were not accepted. In the main, they moved to off-campus apartments either because they disliked regulations, or because they wished to avoid being identified with the dormitory students. Said one: "I didn't enjoy life in the dorms. It was noisy, and I hate regulations of any sort whatsoever—the dorms have certain rules, such as no women, no liquor, and so forth. There were record players going at all hours, screaming and howling, all sorts of animalistic activities. I can't see standing in line and having food dumped on me, either. I decided that possibly my place was not in the dorm."

---

[7] This refers to the reputation the dormitory men had for being socially inept, especially in their behavior with women.

Their inexperience in social affairs, egocentric verbalizations, and nonconformity may have prevented the off-campus men from achieving the sort of social life they desired. By the end of their four years, they had gained an awareness of how their comments might have jarred others in a group situation. They had benefited from being at overseas campuses, or from forming close relationships, and had learned to show recognition of the needs of others to express their ideas and interests. If rushing had occurred in the senior year, these men might have been able to join a fraternity group, and to benefit from further knowledge of social skills.

Most of the off-campus men were characterized by the interviewers as critical, verbally skilled, energetic, troubled, impulsive, and interested in intellectual matters. They seemed to relate to family and friends in ways that were intense and often involved conflict or alienation. One of the students was distinguished by his interest in Christian ethics, which was not that of a constricted and judgmental person, but that of a strongly impulsive person who felt that he could understand pulls toward indulgent or immoral behavior in others and could help them and himself through applying and teaching the principles of his church. In one way or another, the off-campus men in our interview sample stood out as being and perceiving themselves to be "different" from most of the students on campus. Accompanying their feeling of "difference" was a sense of being more intellectual and creative than most of the other students. They showed less interest in social and athletic activities than did men in the affiliated groups. One of their favorite recreational activities was attending movies, which they did more often than men in the other groups. Attendance at movies provided a relatively inexpensive form of recreation and one that did not necessitate much planning ahead or group involvement. (This interest may also have reflected their concern with emotional problems.) The eating-club men shared their interest in movies and attending lectures. However, the clubmen appeared to have been interested in service to others and in political activities, and this interest was not evident among the off-campus men.[8] Their greatest involvement was possibly in clarifying their own goals and values. Many were deeply concerned with the meaning of life and with their own identities. Some of them were actively rebelling against their home backgrounds and attempting to find new answers, whereas others came from professional and intellectual families, and were following a family pattern of criticism and dissent.

Many of the off-campus men yearned for something, but found it difficult to define what it was that they actually wanted. One troubled student commented: "There are so many people I've met in different societies, and different things I've seen, and each one hurts me in some way. I've got to read a lot and find out for myself. Everything I see has something wrong with it. I can laugh at everything, but with kind of a sadistic laugh, not a humorous one. In my reading and writing, I'm trying to piece it all together—because then I don't feel so unreal, so lost." He was representative of those off-campus men who came from intellectual and cosmopolitan families, but were thrown early in life upon their own emotional resources. Others of the men had more protective emotional backgrounds, but lacked intellectual stimulation. As these students were very well endowed with intelligence, they were attracted to and stimulated by many of the ideas and opportunities available to them on campus. Their problem lay in choosing among a variety of interests, and in integrating their new experiences into their personalities and life goals. Integrating forces such as identification with an intellectual friend or relative or clear-cut professional aspirations helped some of the students avoid feeling overwhelmed or diffused.

Questionnaire answers indicated that about 45 per cent of the off-campus men shared with the fraternity men an interest in traveling. Of our nine men, three traveled as part of the overseas program, and three as a result of personal restlessness and discontent with their environment. Four of the men interrupted their college careers because of adventurousness, or because they were suspended, and traveled during this period. Traveling may have symbolized their restless attempts to define themselves or to find a place for themselves where they could feel that they belonged. While at the university, they often moved from place to place, or among different groups, critically appraising each situation and finding that it fell short of their expectations. One student, for example, unsuccessful in joining an eating club, became part of a group of students, mostly from the East Coast, who joined an off-campus cooperative whose members were "existentialist" and highly critical of Stanford and the West. "Way-out" ideas were seriously considered and evaluated. Dissatisfied, the student, a Protestant, left this group and joined a Catholic eating cooperative. Later on, he continued to try to clarify his thoughts and values, first attending an overseas campus, then doing service work in an underprivileged community.

---

[8] See Table 45.

The off-campus men's feelings of alienation may result from the turbulence of the separation process from their families, from the rebuffs they receive in the university community, or from feelings of superiority because of their perception of their intellectual and creative capacities. In any event, these students seem more inclined than students in the other subgroups to feel that their college years are not particularly happy ones, to complain of frequent feelings of depression, and to express the wish that they had gone to other universities.[9]

Their independence and sense of confidence in their cognitive skills may have influenced the choice of occupation of the off-campus men: many of them were interested in entering the professions of medicine, law, or engineering, which allow for independent action. This may have resulted from their identification with professional parents, since 28 per cent of the off-campus students had professional parents, in contrast with 15 per cent to

---

[9] Only a fourth of the off-campus men indicated that the years from 17–21 were among the three happiest, in contrast to half of the fraternity men. In a write-in question, 16 per cent of the off-campus men (N = 44) indicated the wish that they had gone to other colleges, in contrast to 5 per cent of most of the other subgroups.

19 per cent of the students in the other residence groups. On the other hand, many of the fathers of the off-campus men had not had college educations; for these students, the professions seemed to promise an opportunity for upward mobility. The fact that only a small number of off-campus and dormitory men were interested in business may reflect a disinclination toward the type of adaptation to large groups of people that is often required for success in the business world.

There are many reasons why individuals have a desire for independence. These reasons include such diverse factors as distrust of others, confidence in one's own capacities, identification with independent persons, and fearfulness of accepting dependency need and obligations. All these reasons appeared in one or another of our students' case histories. Another possible factor is ordinal position. In our interview sample, all but one of the nine men were oldest children. Assuming that dormitory living provides the most dependent and institutionalized form of living, and that off-campus housing is the least institutionalized and provides the greatest independence, it is interesting to note that the proportion of oldest sons in our interview sample increased as the students chose housing in harmony with the above assumption. From our data, it appears that being oldest may coincide with desiring independence in living arrangements. More than twice as many off-campus men as fraternity men came from families with sisters only. Perhaps having sisters and no brothers may be associated with an unwillingness to live with a large group of men. There were more only children among the least gregarious group in our sample—the dormitory men—than in the other groups. Men with brothers only were more apt to join fraternities and eating clubs, while the off-campus men—or those unwilling to live with large groups of men—were least likely to have brothers. Since our interview sample was relatively small, these observations are far from conclusive, and should be considered only as offering suggestions regarding motivations for choosing housing-affiliation groups, and as a basis for further explorations.

The fraternity men who lived in off-campus apartments shared with the off-campus men an interest in seeking out off-beat places and people. Although only a small proportion of men noted this as a "frequent" activity, fewer of the off-campus men "never" engaged in this sort of activity than the men in other housing groups did. All those who lived in off-campus apartments appeared to be the least religious of those we interviewed. They were less inclined to participate in church-connected activities, and were least likely to pray.

While the fraternity men, who respected authority figures, felt that they had changed as a result of ideas presented in courses or by teachers, the off-campus men were less inclined to acknowledge such influence. This was in harmony with their argumentative and rebellious attitude toward figures of authority. Members of this group were very critical about the Stanford administration. One student commented: "The right of the student is to satisfy his intellectual curiosity without interference from the administration, whose sole activities should be housekeeping, getting funds, and so forth. Conflicts between departments should be handled by the Academic Council. I think students are treated like employees in a company with no rights. They can be thrown out for some action that has absolutely nothing to do with the academic environment. Students have the right to indicate what type of courses should be offered. Another thing, the whole idea of a major is a ridiculous thing. From my point of view, there were a lot of courses I wanted to take but couldn't, as a result of the requirements for my major. With most people going into graduate school nowadays, I think the student's ends could be better served if he could pick out his own courses as an undergraduate according to his own interests. A major is important only in terms of an occupation. If you plan to go on to graduate school, the *raison d'être* of a major disappears."

Regarding a controversial issue involving the administration, he remarked: "I am delighted with the present problem. The students now psychologically have the advantage over the administration. The administration is defensive. They are just looking for a way out right now. Now they have been found out to have a scandal among their own administrators—this has undermined the prestige or image of the administrators. Now they cannot say, 'We are the administration, and we run the school, and the rest of you are peons.'" With reference to regulations, he said: "I am against overnight regulations—you can't regulate morality. My attitude is, if the administration approves of something, why not oppose it? I feel that the administration uses student groups as catspaws—so it looks as if students have enforced something when it is the Deans of Men and Women who are actually at the back of it." Predictably, this student had evidenced prior to college a spirit of independence and a desire to challenge authority and to institute what he perceived as necessary changes and reforms.

A clue to this attitude toward authority may be found in the relationship of some of the off-campus men with their parents, especially their fathers. The fathers of the physicists-to-be resembled those of the "dorm men," with their emphasis on hard work and tendency toward minimal communication with family members. The rootless ones felt that their fathers were distant from them, and had given them a freedom that verged on indifference. "My father is a walking encyclopedia. He will condemn me if he feels that I have done something wrong, but he won't stop me. I think he puts a certain amount of trust in me, which in some cases I've justified and in others I've not. I was very intolerant of Mother's worrying and nagging. I resemble my father in that we both want to do things. He does a lot of traveling, and whatever strikes his fancy, he will do. I didn't go to my parents with my problems. I don't think there was much need to go to them—whatever interests me is OK with them. They don't care. They figure it's up to me." A hard-drinking student commented: "My father has always said: Do what the strength of your convictions—your intuition—tells you to do. He's brilliant, intellectual, fond of the finer things in life. He knows many people from different areas and classes. I haven't seen much of him—I was at prep school or traveling, and when I'm home, he commutes." A third student, who, like the one just quoted, had lost his mother during preadolescence, commented: "My dad was a yeller and a screamer, and he still is. I don't have much trouble with him; I know how to handle him pretty well. He is very intelligent, and if you get him reasoning, he won't yell and scream. But once he blows, it's all over." Other comments about fathers by the off-campus interviewees seem to indicate considerable ambivalence. In some instances, the fathers had experienced failure, and the students were placed in the threatening position of feeling destined to surpass their fathers, whose lives had been a disappointment to themselves and their wives. Sometimes the men were openly critical of their fathers, while at other times they were strongly defensive of them.

The upwardly mobile students among the off-campus men were often critical of their families. "My father is dependent, childish. He tries to be fair, and a good person, but he never puts all the facts at his command together like I do. He doesn't worry until a crisis occurs," one remarked. On the other hand, some were defensive about their fathers' lack of material success: "I'm like my father in that I'm stubborn. My father has had a lot of influence on me—the idea that I should work hard and be successful. I get my literary ability from him; he would have been a top-notch writer or teacher if he hadn't married before he finished college. He loves his family very much, but he has a bad temper. He pays his bills first and then enjoys spending money on racing and gambling. I am like my mother. We are both easily hurt." These four students were intense, ambitious, and had intellectual aspirations. For a variety of reasons, they had been dissatisfied with their former environment, and self-confident that they could design a better life for themselves. At the university, their critical attitude, ambition, and restlessness continued. One remarked, with regard to his laboring class parents: "My parents don't read at all, so I can't talk to them. Their interests are in things I don't care for. My younger brothers aren't intellectual. There are almost no intellectual adults in my small town."

The freedom with which the off-campus men were able to evaluate others was shared by only two of the nine dormitory men in our interview sample. These two, whom we dubbed "genius-isolates" were very critical of their fathers, whom they felt to be strong-willed and stubborn, and with whom communication and cooperation seemed impossible. However, even these two students were not as free to criticize others as the off-campus men were. Although they had hostile and aggressive feelings, their psychic structures were such that the expression of these feelings was blocked. They threw their tremendous talents and energies into creative work in the sciences. They were convinced of their genius, and the day did not have sufficient hours for them to devote to their work. They were stimulated by abstract or theoretical ideas in fields such as philosophy and political science. People, however, seemed to make them anxious, and they tended to be isolated. These two students differed from the majority of the dormitory students, although socially their behavior had many similarities. They were more global and adventurous in their thinking, and occasionally behaved in a rather impulsive way, with manifestations of hostility or creativity. The other dormitory men in our sample tended to be conservative, hard-working, reliable, and over-controlled. All nine were shy, distrustful of others, and work-oriented. They kept to themselves, and limited their social, athletic, and recreational activities. They were interested in completing each academic assignment in an irreproachable manner and obtaining the highest possible grade. Only the two scientists were inclined toward rebellious and non-conforming behavior, but even they were usually too busy with their work and theoretical preoccupations to get seriously involved in other matters.

Of all groups in our sample, the dormitory men seemed to have remained the most constant in regard to the aspect of self-evaluation. The dormitory group contained the largest percentage of men who drank lightly or were abstainers. In their occupational interests, very few of the dormitory men were interested in business, but a large percentage were interested in fields that might involve college teaching or research. The dormitory men shared with the off-campus fraternity men and the off-campus men in general an interest in the professions. Like the relatively intellectual men in the eating clubs, the dormitory men were quite low in their interest in future family and love and affection, and high in their interest in intellectual and artistic matters. One way that they differed from the clubmen was that their postgraduate values did not include a great interest in helping others.

The dormitory men indicated that they had not changed much over the college years. They changed less than men in other groups regarding intellectual interest, freedom to express feelings, and kinds of friends. In regard to reasons for change, they indicated that problems in their families, and the problems of others had little to do with the changes that took place. The same was true for involvement in matters that dealt with social and political improvements. What had influenced them more than other groups of students were ideas from books read on their own and the discovering of new capacities in themselves. About a fifth (N = 42) of the dormitory men and a fourth of the clubmen listed the living group as a great influence in changes that occurred to them during college. This is significantly less than was true for the fraternity men (61 per cent of the on-campus fraternity men and 50 per cent of the off-campus fraternity men ascribed great influence to the living group), but considerably more than was true for the off-campus men who belonged to no fraternity. Only 2 of the 45 men said that their living group had greatly influenced them to change.

A reason for change given by a relatively large number of the dormitory men was involvement with student organizations. This is worthy of further comment. Some of the shy, small-town, constricted young men in our interview sample had lived in the same dormitory, and often in the same house within the dormitory, for four years. By their senior year, some of them had been asked to take offices and responsibilities in the houses where they lived, and they had been deeply pleased by this opportunity and had attempted to rise to it. Their new positions involved working with other people toward common goals in a relatively narrow area; but for these constricted young men, it was an opportunity to venture out of their own personal lives in a way that was not frightening or overwhelming. This may suggest to the educator a way to help such shy and reserved young men.[10]

We observed that dormitory men tended to avoid offbeat places and people, and participated less frequently than other men in most recreational activities. They were significantly less inclined to be involved frequently in activities of a social and athletic nature. The activities that involved them most frequently were social events connected with churches, attendance at symphonies and the theatre, and visits to museums. Although a segment of the dormitory men were involved in religious commitment and church-sponsored social events, there also appeared to be a large group in the dormitories who were indifferent or even anti-religious.

---

[10] More than twice as often as men in other residential groups, dormitory men reported participation in student organizations and committees as causing changes in themselves; 24 per cent of the dormitory men attributed change to such activities in contrast to 2 per cent of the unaffiliated off-campus men.

Responses from the larger questionnaire sample have indicated that the dormitories tended to attract as four-year residents the students who were most isolated and constricted. The dormitory men in our interview sample came from families where the parents had been relatively unsociable, and somewhat older than the parents of men in the other groups. The larger questionnaire sample supported the impression the nine interviewees gave of being serious, hard-working men who wanted a limited amount of personal interaction with other people. For some, this reflected feelings of personal inadequacy and fear of criticism or of experiencing closeness. These men seemed to think of themselves as workers rather than as changing, developing, and interacting individuals. They tended to treat the university as a vocational experience. They were often conservative in their behavior and views, and preferred to live within a narrow and limited life-space. The description given by a steady girlfriend of one of these students could apply to most of the men in this group: "He generally keeps to himself, and talks little except with his family, or unless the subject is engineering or physics. He spends much of his free time on engineering or in sleeping. He enjoys picnicking, camping, going to the mountains or beach. He is a conscientious worker outside of school, and finishes what he starts. He doesn't participate in normal 'fun' activities, but is well-liked and respected by his co-workers. He is content with himself as he is—pleased that he is competent where others aren't. Sometimes I wish he would appear to enjoy life more by some show of excitement or enthusiasm over something I could understand, but I think he would rather enjoy life in his own way—and who but he can say which way is better for him?" This student, along with several others in our interview sample, treated Stanford as a place of training, and consciously determined to avoid social and emotional involvements while in school. Two men who were drifting toward marriage had chosen high school friends who, prior to college, were "like members of the family." Some dormitory men seemed to prefer the familiar and predictable in social relations, and others kept themselves relatively isolated.

The dormitory men's reserve was combined with a cheerful, distant type of friendliness for the majority. Comments like "the folks and I went everywhere together" were common in descriptions of their high school days. In some instances, the sons were following their fathers' vocational interests; others were attempting to achieve professional status with the encouragement of fathers who had had no opportunity for formal education beyond high school.

The fathers, as described by the boys, were quiet, hard-working, thrifty, conscientious, often stubborn, men with whom it was difficult to converse or argue. The mothers frequently were involved in church work, were careful housekeepers, frugal, quiet, hard-working, perfectionistic, and more outgoing than the fathers. The families had been isolated geographically, or had limited their social contacts to a few relatives or old friends. They had moved about very little, and with a few exceptions, had been characterized by stability. The students themselves were often described by friends as very stable. This stability was sometimes accompanied by passivity and avoidance of change. They had depended on other family members for services and physical presence. If their home situation had satisfied them, they were content to retain their emotional attachments to it. They chose as friends one or two men who were hard-working and disinterested in personal involvement. If the home situation had been unsatisfactory, the student hoped to depend as much as possible on his own resources or on impersonal sources for gratification of his needs. In either case, most of these students lived in the dormitories for four years and were content as long as their physical needs were cared for with a minimal demand of time and money.

Although most of the dormitory men we interviewed were courteous, industrious men who tended to deny their hostile feelings or to control all feelings to the point where intimacy was sacrificed, a few were more passionate, and seemed fearful about the aggression of others and their own anger. In their descriptions of their homes, they often portrayed a father who was quiet and amiable until crossed, and then stubborn and irritable. Since the father usually was a devoted family man, the son and mother often combined forces to avoid situations that would disturb his equanimity. However, in most cases, the mother seemed unable to protect the man from his fears of the father, from his own anger, and from the father's wrath, although it is hard to say definitely, since some of the students who were particularly isolated and wary of others responded to our questions about their families with reticence or contradictions. Interviews with these men sometimes elicited inappropriate comments regarding hostility, or expressions of fear about their inability to control their own rage.

Many dormitory men had committed themselves to a vocation and way of life prior to college. Of the nine students in this group, two were engineers, two were premedical students, and the others were in a variety of fields. All these students had placed themselves in situations that required long hours of hard work. Excellent grades in demanding courses were necessary for the maintenance of scholarships or for entrance into graduate schools. The young men viewed themselves mainly as workers, and had recognition of their worth from their academic departments and from future employers. An interviewer commented about one of these students: "Although his whole orientation is to work and productivity, he does seem to obtain real satisfaction out of it. The trouble is, he seems unable to have fun in any other way. He is indeed machine-oriented, and may be something like a machine himself."

Most of these students had moral, political, and religious values that emphasized individual initiative. For the most part, they wanted institutions that either let the individual alone, or supported such characteristics as hard work, thrift, and virtue. They were not rebellious, or inclined to break rules, or to go in for heavy drinking. Regarding religion, they either were traditionalists, or had become confirmed agnostics after a period of soul-searching while in high school. Politically, they, like most Stanford men at the time of our study, tended to adopt a passive attitude toward political issues, but their preference was for a conservative approach to economics and politics.

All the dormitory men in our interview sample were concerned in one way or another with the value of money, the value of time, and the importance of orderliness. Although most of them were content to anticipate modest but hard-earned incomes, two were conspicuously eager for great wealth. Because of either shyness, low family income, or of family patterns of thrift, the dormitory men spent little money on dates, parties, or trips to San Francisco: cultural activities that they could attend alone or with another man seemed to them a more justifiable expenditure of time and money. They considered drinking a waste of both.

Most of them were prompt and reliable about time. One student commented about a friend he liked: "I don't know about his negative traits; I always try to think in positive terms. A lot of times he's late. This has always been one of my pet peeves. It was part of my bringing up. My parents think there is something radically wrong if you can't be on time. We live a hundred miles from nowhere, and yet we get places on time." And time enters into a later comment by the same student in talking about the wish that his friendships had been closer: "I would like all my friends to be closer. Perhaps lack of time to discuss things prevented this." Another student commented at the end of four years that he regretted his lack of time for lectures, participation in the university community, and getting to know the faculty. Regarding the last, he added that he didn't have any questions to ask them, and didn't like to take up their time for nothing.

With one exception, the dormitory men were fastidious in their appearance. Their rooms were orderly, and they expressed resentment of slovenliness in others. Regarding a freshman roommate, a student commented: "We have our little differences. We have common interests, but since we come from two completely different backgrounds, we once in a while have our little clashes in personalities. We have no real outbursts, but I come from a home where everything is always neat, and so naturally, I keep my side of the room neat. My roommate tends to scatter papers all over the room, and his bed is usually unmade. Shoes on the floor and all that kind of thing irritate me a little bit, but I try to overlook it. Mother is very neat and orderly, and likes things run on schedule, and so do I." Three years later, the same student commented: "I had this roommate all year, although we didn't get along very well. I gained a lot from this. We kept up a surface friendliness. I think it was very important that I learned to tolerate this and control my emotions, and not break out and shout at him. I tried not to care about it. Many times his friends would come in at one or two o'clock, and I would be in bed, but I never let anyone in the dorm know that I was angry. I let off steam by writing home." Only one man, a scientist, was conspicuously disorderly. According to a friend, "he kept his room in an unbelievable state—an absolute shambles—with bed never made, sheets seldom changed, desk stacked high with books, and closet crammed with junk."

As indicated by the students we interviewed and the answers the men gave on the Senior Questionnaire, many of the dormitory men had limited social lives. They usually had only a few men friends and were reserved in their relationships with them. They either dated infrequently, or moved from their parental homes to early marriages with girls from their home towns whom they had known prior to college. In regard to most activities that involved social life or recreation, the dormitory men were more isolated than the other men.

The "genius-isolates" dealt with their lack of involvement with others by openly acknowledging to the interviewers their anxiety in this area, and indicating that creative efforts in their chosen field provided a gratifying sublimation for their feelings of inadequacy as social beings. One of these students found himself less interested in social contact and personal involvement at the end of his undergraduate years than he had felt as a freshman. A brilliant young man with a long history of being a "loner," he had been thrown on his own resources at an early age, and had been humiliated by a penurious and rejecting father. His academic success made him feel free to avoid human contact, and to relinquish the humanitarian attitudes that had characterized him earlier in his academic career: "When I entered Stanford, I didn't really mind meeting people and doing and seeing things, but I do now. For one thing, I don't have as much in common with others as I did when I first entered, because now I'm not interested in anything that isn't in my field. I'm an introvert most of the time. I've always been terribly shy—the trouble is that I don't want to work on it. I'm sure I would have moved more at another college. When you have a lot of inhibitions and lots of inertia, you just don't want to get over that barrier. I won't even place myself in a situation where I can work on it. I used to laugh at almost everything, anytime, anywhere, but now, if it's not intellectual enough, I just give a surface laugh. I get a kick out of things that are subtly humorous—that have some ingenuity behind them. I like solving problems. I like delving into problems.

γ

When my intellect is resting or isn't constantly searching, then I'm bored and dissatisfied." When asked if he felt that his feeling of alienation was undesirable, he responded: "No, I'm not really sorry. I feel that it is a bit of a loss, but it is something I don't want to correct. I suppose I could have taken some positive steps somewhere along the line."

The friendships of almost all the students in this group were characterized by a lack of personal involvement. One student, in discussing his roommate and closest friend during college, gave an extreme example of this phenomenon: "I don't really know Joe very well—we just go fishing together." (What do you talk about in your room?) "Fishing." (Not about yourselves?) "Hardly at all. We don't talk about backgrounds. Just incidentally. I kid him about being a country boy and he kids me about coming from the city. We don't talk much about our work. We don't understand each other's fields. I don't think if either of us had a personal problem we would go to the other one. When we fish together, we talk about how we would rather fish than get back to the books, or we talk about different types of bait, or fishing trips. I don't like anyone who's bossy and wants his own way. He's been my roommate for three years, and we get along fine. He does what he wants to do and I do what I want to do. I get along with most people, although I don't like to be around a lot of people. I don't have a lot of real close friends, but I don't have any enemies either."

An attitude of acceptance of their inability or lack of desire to cope with problems in interpersonal relations was characteristic of some of the students, and may have been a reflection of a generally passive attitude. Many of the students were content to adapt to dormitory conditions they found unsatisfactory, or to academic demands that oppressed them, or to other displeasing situations, rather than actively attempting to make more satisfactory modifications. In some instances, the student's initiative and independent spirit may have been stifled at an early age. In other instances, his behavior reflected identifications with parents or relatives who behaved in a passive or constricted way.

One dormitory man who was attempting to cope with his inertia in social matters described the process for us: "I had to work at it more than other people—that is, to force myself to be with others. Left to myself, I wanted to be more by myself. But I forced myself to participate in debate and in intramural sports. It takes a little bit more effort to meet people. It is much easier to be introverted; then there is no danger from the world—no danger of being criticized. We would all like to be star football players, but we can't—not all of us. What I really like to do is to enjoy a lemonade, a good book, and soft hi-fi music." He indicated dissatisfaction with his relationships and a determination to work on them even though his extra time was limited. His academic abilities were rather mediocre for the university and for his professional aspirations. He described his mother as lively and flexible—a contrast and stimulus to him in avoiding the rigidities, reticence, and social awkwardness of his father. Because of his idiosyncrasies, he must have met rebuffs as he cheerfully attempted to mix with others, but eventually he developed some social skill, if not greater empathy for others. This grew with his self-confidence, and was a product of hard work and determination. His comments reveal attitudes about a much earlier struggle. As a child he was physically inept and had a speech defect, but was determined to overcome these handicaps. Although far from being a warm, empathic, and spontaneous person, he was moving in that direction. Admission to professional school was the signal that he could relax a little, and he commented that he wished that this had been possible earlier. As a senior, he admitted indulging in the luxury of occasionally coming to class a few minutes late—an indulgence that he could not have allowed himself as a freshman.

Although the dormitory men liked the company of women, most of them were shy and hesitant about asking for dates. When questioned during the senior year, 26 per cent of the dormitory men reported that they had had no dates at all during the senior year. In contrast, 16 per cent of the off-campus men, and 1 per cent to 5 per cent of the men in the fraternities and eating clubs reported a no-dating status during the senior year. From our interview sample, we gained the impression that the dormitory men were in need of guidance and education in social interactions and in gaining respect for themselves as persons. The stress that they seemed able to face was that of occasional feelings of loneliness or boredom. The stress that they were more reluctant to bring into awareness was that connected with their feelings of inadequacy as people and their difficulties in coping with anger or sexuality in themselves and others. A difficulty that they shared with the fraternity men involved limited skills in communication and avoidance of introspection. In general, the dormitory men were not at ease in social situations, nor could they verbalize their needs as well as others. These handicaps served to make their isolation that much deeper.

In conclusion, what are some of the things that the university expects of the student in addition to the many compartmentalized and loosely integrated tasks demanded by his courses? Possibly, the university hopes to produce an individual who thinks in a certain way. This individual might be expected to look at himself, society, and history in a way that is based on knowledge and welded together by a balanced and integrated attitude; he should have a receptivity for a broad variety of ideas and yet be capable at any time of taking a stand and committing himself to action. Ideally, this commitment would be harmonious with the sum total of his integrated knowledge at a specific time, and not be a sort of cemented commitment that resembles rigidity. It is obvious that these goals cannot be achieved during the few hours a week that the student is in the classroom; and that the extracurricular experiences of the student are relevant to both his developmental and his educational goals.

We did not start out with a specific interest in residential arrangements, but the importance of this aspect of college life to the students forced itself upon us. In the light of the information we have gathered, we offer several observations and recommendations. First, the relationship between the social environment of the students and intellectual receptivity and emotional well-being was frequently noted by students and interviewers over the four years. In the interviews, most of the students indicated that a great deal of their mental and psychic energy was involved in developing a sense of their own separateness and uniqueness, and in modifying their behavior so that they could relate to others in a gratifying and meaningful way. The residence groups to which they belonged played an important part in defining the patterns of adaptation. Second, although generalizations about subgroups may not prove true of all individuals within each group, a difference can be discerned between groups in regard to certain values, interests, and behavior. Unless a university's admission policy is such that a small homogeneous group is admitted, there probably will be considerable variation among students in their social development and in their perception of their social needs. With this in mind, we recommend diversity in housing arrangements and flexibility over the college years in allowing students to move from one group to another. Third, our experience suggests that ascertaining the characteristics of subgroups within a college is a worthwhile research project for the university to undertake. Research into the experiences of individuals should precede suggestions for change. What might be helpful for individuals in one group might be unnecessary, irrelevant, or even harmful for another group. Such research should be undertaken at fairly frequent intervals, since the college social scene seems to be in a state of rapid change.

How could the students themselves be encouraged to ameliorate their adjustment difficulties? The clubmen in our study believed that they had experienced beneficial changes and an increased sense of self-esteem over the college years. With their relatively greater interest in service to others and in social and political improvement, they possibly could further contribute to the university community and their own education by administering a service center comparable to the Phillips Brooks House at Harvard. Such a suggestion is made with full awareness of the excellent work already done at Stanford by a number of service-oriented organizations. However, apparently there is still room for a greater variety of students to participate more fully in such activities if opportunities are made available. This sort of activity might enhance the self-esteem of the clubmen and their status among their fellow students. Improvement of their physical plants would also be of benefit to them.

The fraternity men could be encouraged to follow in the footsteps of adult fraternal groups and offer more services to others. For example, their aid could be enlisted in providing publicity and financial assistance for a service center and in participating in a variety of service activities. Out of this sort of experence, they might gain more empathy and understanding of individuals different from themselves. Many fraternity men have athletic knowledge and skills that could be transmitted to young people from less privileged backgrounds. (Some of the fraternity men had held summer jobs in the recreational field, and had experience in encouraging others to enjoy leisure time activities.) Teaching others their own skills could conceivably enhance the fraternity men's feeling of usefulness and give them a better understanding of the problems faced by the upward mobile young person. Modification in the intellectual level of the fraternities could possibly be achieved in an evolutionary fashion by a revision of the rushing procedure that would give the seniors more weight than other fraternity men in the process of selecting pledges. Test scores show that fraternity seniors tested higher on scales such as Social Maturity, and lower in Authoritarianism than fraternity men did as entering freshmen. (Their rate of change was about the same as that of other men in our total sample.) Since such changes seem to indicate a greater capacity to view social and psychological factors in a more complex open-minded manner, the seniors might be able to evaluate potential pledges in a way that would bring into the fraternities students less inclined toward elitism and masculine bravado. Our interview experience has shown that the fraternity underclassmen we saw were more prone to drink heavily, disparage academic involvement, and display disregard for community approval than the upperclassmen were. A group like the Inter-fraternity Council might offer to provide a setting and professional services for group discussions modeled after group psychotherapy. Such groups might have more attraction for fraternity members than more individualized guidance services do, and might have preventive as well as curative functions. In addition to helping individual students with personal problems, such groups might add to the general information about ingroup tensions. This information could provide for modification of fraternity life and also have implications for other groups dependent upon ingroup solidarity for achievement of common goals.

Given the characteristics of the dormitory men in our interview sample, it seems probable that one way to increase their social capacities lies in increasing their social experiences. Greater encouragement of on-campus and off-campus organizations serving the needs of the students would be helpful: we described the function of church groups in this regard. We reported that some dormitory men, especially in their last year or two as undergraduates, discovered that they had the ability to work with other men on committees within their houses in the dormitories; their participation in this work should be encouraged. Another way to assist the dormitory men lies in enlisting the cooperation of the student employment services. If these men could be placed in positions that involved working with others, they might develop more ease in social contacts. Dealing with unfamiliar people in work situations helped some of our interviewees. If students as reserved and shy as some of our dormitory men were given jobs as waiters or desk clerks in libraries, for example, it might be more helpful to them than to have jobs in which they had little contact with other people.

The off-campus men could benefit from the type of plan that attempts to introduce into the housing units more of the intellectual and cultural aspects of the university community. Certain members of other groups, especially the "genius-isolates" of the dormitories, might enjoy a social milieu that stressed a sharing of abstract ideas rather than camaraderie or mutual dependence and empathy. The off-campus men who often complain about a lack of intellectuality in the dormitories could possibly relate more easily to others on this kind of basis. Establishment of small housing units for those with special interests (designated as "drama houses," "creative writing houses," "political problem houses," and the like) with faculty members as residents might have special interest for these students. Residence in such houses might provide these students with a sense of belonging to the university and aid them in overcoming their feelings of dissatisfaction or alienation.

Such "special interest" houses suggest a possibility for helping freshmen. As freshmen, many of our students felt that the university was very demanding academically but not sufficiently rewarding intellectually. They often came from accelerated high-school classes and were enthusiastic about intellectual ideas. Their feeling of intellectual let-down might be alleviated if they were able to choose houses within the freshman dormitories on the basis of their special interests, skills, or curiosities. At a time when all is unfamiliar, it might be helpful to find new friends with shared meaningful interests. It would hasten their acceptance of the university as an intellectual and cultural community, and might affect the nature of housing groups that would be formed later. After such an introduction to the university community, freshmen who later joined fraternities might bring to the fraternity subculture a more open acceptance of esthetic and intellectual interests. These few suggestions are offered in support of our contention that knowledge of the college careers of men in various groups could lead to recommendations beneficial to the needs and values of the individual.

Finally, regardless of their place of residence, almost all the men benefited in their social development from attendance at our overseas campuses. Here, regardless of interests, they were placed in relatively homogeneous groups in unfamiliar environments. This necessitated their being helpful to each other. Because of the novelty of being abroad for a limited period, enjoyment of new experiences and pleasure was approved and expected. This was a particularly valuable experience for the dormitory men. Competition was less fierce overseas than on the home campus because of the nature of the curriculum, the special selection of students, and the even numbers of men and women. The students tended to explore the surrounding areas in groups rather than as couples, and the emphasis on coquetry and sexual competitiveness was replaced by a more leisurely opportunity to get to know members of the opposite sex as individuals and friends. In our interview sample, we saw dormitory men delighted with themselves for having been able to enjoy feminine companionship and group fun; we saw fraternity men expressing interest in artistic and cultural matters without feeling that this was inappropriate masculine behavior; and we saw off-campus men learning, through inescapable group involvement, that they could modify some of their behavior in the interests of getting along with others.

We recommend that attempts to modify the various living milieus be the products of joint efforts on the part of students and administration. The administration, besides having professional skills, provides a continuity of experiences that is lacking among the constantly changing student population. On the other hand, the students may be more responsive to the urgency of their developmental tasks and the effect of the many rapid changes that are occurring at the universities on their personal and social lives. They usually are better informed than anyone else about what goes on in their residences. Research into the nature of student populations should be repeated at appropriate intervals in order to ascertain changing conditions and to avoid self-perpetuating but inappropriate regulations.

As we look back critically, it seems to us that none of the existing housing arrangements for the men are ideal for meeting the developmental needs of the students and the goals of the university. Possibly the universities tend to overemphasize intellectual capacities and tasks. However, since man is a unitary creature, when his physical and social needs are disregarded or minimized the whole man suffers. It is likely that such neglect will interfere with the intellectual process itself. Often it appears that housing arrangements—the circumstances under which the students spend a great proportion of their time—have been more or less left to chance, to matters of economic efficiency, or to artistic design, and have not been thought through in terms of the developmental and intellectual needs of the students.

The developmental tasks of the individual are many and difficult, and require years beyond college for fulfillment. Some of the tasks that occupied the students we interviewed included searching for autonomy, evaluating oneself as a separate individual, and achieving a loosening of symbiotic attachment to the parental home. Other tasks involved developing the capacity to formulate and move toward the sort of life one can create out of the multitude of opportunities in the environment and the great variety of personal potentialities.

For his security and growth, the student needs to find ways to meet both his needs for autonomy and his social needs. The latter requires the capacity to give and to receive, to laugh and have fun, to be refreshed and recreated by the stimulus of other personalities and patterns of motivation, and to move toward adult assumption of responsibility and commitment in interpersonal relations. To achieve these social ends, the student must develop skills and patterns of adaptation that may not have been demanded of him as a younger person in his family and home community. It is our belief that proper residential and social facilities based on an understanding of the special needs of the members of subgroups can substantially aid the individual student in this difficult but essential and rewarding process.

8

STUDENTS WHO SEEK PSYCHIATRIC HELP

Ving Ellis

Of the 3,474 students who entered the University of California at Berkeley in the fall of 1961 as undergraduate freshmen, 493, or about 14 per cent, availed themselves of the services of the psychiatric clinic at the student health service, Cowell Memorial Hospital, during the four undergraduate years ending in June, 1965.

The psychiatric clinic, which is essentially restricted to the use of students, and is financed by a share of the student's incidental fee, is housed in one wing of Cowell, which has a capacity of approximately 130 beds. The clinic is adequately staffed with psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychiatric social workers, who treat students mainly on an outpatient basis. All psychiatric care is voluntary, that is, it is given only at the request of the student.

The Cowell psychiatric clinic has been practicing an "open door" policy for many years. Would-be patients are seen promptly instead of being put on a waiting list, and scheduling of interviews is flexible. Students continue with their initial interviewer as therapist, unless there is a specific reason for transfer to another psychotherapist. Although the Cowell therapists are of many schools, they all tend toward an ego-oriented psychotherapy focused on adaptation and integration rather than on adjustment and conformity to the expectations of others.

When a student applies to the Cowell psychiatric clinic for help, he fills out an application form consisting of a face sheet for family and personal information and an attached sheet on which he is asked to respond to the following questions: *(1) What prompts you to come to the clinic at this time? Describe problems. (2) Describe recent upsetting occurrences.*

Data from this application were utilized in an analysis of the total sample of 493 students presented here. Twenty-two of these students took part in our interviews. We have data for 265 of these students (120 males and 145 females), obtained from the battery of psychological tests we administered when they entered as freshmen in 1961. For 91 students (46 males and 45 females), there are test data on entry in 1961, and on departure in 1965.

Entering students learn about the Cowell psychiatric clinic in a variety of ways. There is a brief mention of the service in the general catalogue, and an article about the clinic and its services is usually run in the student newspaper at the beginning of the semester. It is probable that most students hear about the clinic by word of mouth. A breakdown of the total sample of the 493 students over the four years indicates the following distribution of sources of referral:

TABLE 48

DISTRIBUTION OF SOURCES OF REFERRAL
(N = 493)

Source	*Number*	*Per cent*
Self-referred	335	68
Student Health Service	43	9
Counselors and advisors (academic)	32	6
Deans	27	5
Other students	22	4
Parents and other relatives	12	3
Other	22	4

A distribution of students by sex indicates that 252 men and 241 women used the psychiatric services. Although in absolute numbers more men than women used the services of the clinic (252 to 241), the percentage of women who used the clinic was greater, since 43 per cent of the students of this class were women and 57 per cent were men. Nineteen-year-olds constituted the largest percentage of clinic patients (31 per cent), with eighteen-year-olds (27 per cent) and twenty-year-olds (18 per cent) next.

TABLE 49

NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

Patients		*Number of*	*Berkeley Students*	
Number	*Per cent*	*Siblings*[a]	*Number*	*Per cent*
			(Senior Questionnaire Samples)	
80	16	0	57	10
197	40	1	186	34
136	28	2	148	27
46	9	3	87	16
32	8	4 or more	60	11
Not reporting				
2	1		17	3
493			555	

[a] In comparing students with no siblings, with one sibling, and with two or more siblings, $p < .01$.

There have been many hypotheses about the effects of siblings and their rivalries and positions on the growth, development, and intelligence of children. Among the students who came to the clinic, the greatest number were only children or children with only one sibling. We also computed ordinal position, and found that in the patient sample, 63 per cent of the men and 64 per cent of the women, including only children, were first-born, while only 57 per cent of the men and women in our Senior Questionnaire sample were first-born. This difference is statistically significant ($p < .05$). Studies summarized by William D. Altus indicate that first-born are present in greater proportions in the brighter segments of the population.[1] These children seem more achievement-oriented than others, and have a greater "conscience" development.[2]

---

[1] Altus, William D. "Birth Order and Its Sequelae." *Science*, 1966, *151*, 44–49.

[2] See Note 4 below, page 321.

Sixty-six different majors were listed by the students in our study (N = 493). On the whole, each major seemed to contribute its appropriate share of patients. Our figures seem to counter the commonly held belief that students in the natural sciences utilize psychiatric clinics less than students in the humanities. Engineering students did use the clinic in lesser proportions. On the other hand, the number of social science majors making use of the clinic was not disproportionate to their numbers in the population. Business administration and history majors seemed to underuse the clinic. Grade-point averages reported by the students upon application to the clinic were as follows:

TABLE 50

DISTRIBUTION BY GRADE-POINT AVERAGE

Grade-point Average	*Number*	*Per cent*
Not reporting	104	21
1.9 or below	52	11
2.9 to 2.0	233	47
4.0 to 3.0	104	21

The notion that the students who use psychiatric clinics are those who excel *academically* does not seem to be borne out here.[3] At the same time, their performance is not lower than that of their peers. In aptitude and intelligence, however, the patients were superior. Their verbal and mathematical Scholastic Aptitude Test scores were significantly higher ($p < .01$) than those of their peers.[4] Moreover, the patients obtained significantly higher scores than non-patients on cognitive and other personality scales (see Tables 54 through 57). One hundred and thirty-seven of the students (or 31.85 per cent) reported previous counseling; and 83 students, or 16.84 per cent, reported previous psychotherapy.

[3] The cumulative senior GPA for patients on the basis of the Registrar's records were: Men patients 2.62 (N = 125), women patients 2.65 (N = 122). In two random senior samples from the whole class, the GPA for the men was 2.64 (N = 400); for the women, 2.65 (N = 400).

[4]

SAT SCORES—BERKELEY

	Male Patients (N = 220)	*Male Students* (N = 1857)	*Female Patients* (N = 211)	*Female Students* (N = 1494)
Verbal	584 (91)	584 (93)	577 (86)	544 (86)
Mathematical	662 (84)	606 (88)	545 (85)	519 (88)

Of the 493 students who came to the psychiatric clinic, 321 later dropped out of school. In a separate study of dropouts, using Student Development Study data, it was found that during the four-year period following initial admission to the university, a total of approximately 59 per cent of the class interrupted their stay at Berkeley.[5] Of these, 9 per cent subsequently returned, leaving about 50 per cent of the original group still registered at the end of the fourth year.

In the present sample of 493 students, of the 321 who interrupted their stay at Berkeley, 77, or about 24 per cent, returned to the Berkeley campus. In comparing the sample with the whole class, it might be said that although more people who come to the psychiatric clinic tend to drop out of school (65 per cent, as opposed to 59 per cent), the proportion of returnees is considerably greater among them than among students who do not come to the clinic. It must be stressed that very few students in either group leave as a result of academic failure. This has been true during all the years that records have been kept at Berkeley.

Why do students come to the clinic for help? Their responses to the question, What prompted you to come to the clinic at this time? fall into at least fifty-one distinct categories. In some instances, students complain of difficulties in two or more categories. The distribution of frequency of categories of complaints among our sample was as follows:

TABLE 51

ENTERING COMPLAINTS

Reason for Entering	*Number*	*Per cent*
Depression	91	18
Inability to do schoolwork	80	16
Family problems	32	6
Nervousness, tenseness	31	6
Too personal to state	16	3
Confusion	15	3
Psychosomatic problems	14	3
Strong anxiety	13	3
Not stated	22	4

---

[5] Suczek, Robert F., and Alfert, Elizabeth. *Personality Characteristics of College Dropouts.* Berkeley: Department of Psychiatry, Student Health Service, University of California, 1966.

One hundred and twelve students were seen for a second series of therapy interviews; thirty for a third; five for a fourth; and one for a fifth. The most common complaints, usually stated together, were depression and inability to do schoolwork (18 and 16 per cent respectively). The next most frequent complaint was that of family problems. During the four years 1961–65, forty-one students from our group were admitted to the inpatient service. Of these, twenty-one were hospitalized for three days or less.

All studies dealing with emotional disturbances and their treatment must come to terms with the notion of improvement, or "cure." For the purposes of our study, we used the following as the criteria of improvement: if the rater, following a careful examination of the student's record, decided that the student or the psychotherapist felt that the interaction was of some benefit to the student, the outcome was considered positive and the student was rated as improved. If there was no such evidence, the outcome was considered negative. (In the latter case, there is always the possibility that the student may have benefited by the encounter in ways not recorded by the therapist.) In addition to the author of this chapter, who rated every record, two other psychotherapists with even longer histories of experience with college students in psychotherapy rated every tenth patient record (N = 50) in order to establish reliability of the criteria of ratings. Reliability was found to be very high.[6]

In all five therapy series taken together, 43 per cent of the patients were benefited and 57 per cent were not. Students who were seen for only one hour benefited the least. In the first series, only 7 per cent of the men and 3 per cent of the women seen for one hour were judged to have benefited. If all contacts that were terminated after one hour are omitted from the calculations, the percentage of students benefited goes up from 42 per cent to 58 per cent for the first series.

Why students come for only one hour and then stop is a matter of conjecture. Some probably get what they came for in

[6] The author's judgments agreed with those of the other two raters in (1) 82 per cent and (2) 86 per cent of the cases. The other two agreed with each other in 80 per cent of the judgments. All three agreed in 74 per cent of the judgments.

that period of time. In most cases, however, the student makes a second appointment, but either does not keep it or calls in to cancel it. In some cases, it is clear from the records that the student feels he has made a mistake in coming to the clinic, and does not wish to continue.[7] The figures in Table 52 indicate that students who put in from three to ten hours appear to have the best possibilities of benefit from psychotherapy at the clinic.

TABLE 52

NUMBER OF HOURS SEEN DURING FIRST ADMISSION SERIES
(Males, N = 252) (Females, N = 241)

	Benefited:		*Not Benefited:*	
Hours Seen	*Males Per cent*	*Females Per cent*	*Males Per cent*	*Females Per cent*
1	7	3	47	48
2	16	12	25	19
3	15	20	7	6
4	11	11	8	5
5–10	40	42	11	15
11 or more	12	13	2	7

If one examines a breakdown of diagnoses for these students, it is apparent that the highest frequency of undiagnosed students was among those seen for the least number of hours. Among unbenefited males, 49 per cent were given a "deferred" diagnosis. Of the unbenefited females, 48 per cent received a "deferred" diagnosis—an almost identical percentage as that among students seen for only one hour.

It is of interest to note that 34 per cent of the complaints that students make on entry to the clinic fall into the category of "depression" and "inability to do schoolwork," while the diagnosis "depressive reaction" makes up only 22 per cent of all diagnoses. This may be because in this age group, depression tends to come and go relatively quickly and may not be part of the clinical picture seen by the psychotherapist. The statement that 34 per cent of all intake complaints fall in the categories of

[7] Another service available to students at Berkeley is the Counseling Center. Of the 160 students followed in the Student Development Study, 60 were seen by the Counseling Center and 22 by the psychiatric clinic—a ratio of almost three to one.

depression or inability to do schoolwork does not convey the desperate flavor of the verbatim complaints. Two examples illustrate the poignancy and despair that characterize these presenting problems.

TABLE 53

DISTRIBUTION OF DIAGNOSES

	Frequency: Males (N = 252)		*Frequency: Females* (N = 241)	
Diagnostic Classification	*Benefited Per cent*	*Not Benefited Per cent*	*Benefited Per cent*	*Not Benefited Per cent*
Deferred	14	49	13	48
Anxiety reaction	9	3	5	4
Conversion reaction				2
Obsessive-compulsive reaction	4	1	1	2
Depressive reaction	8	3	7	4
Schizoid personality	8	6		6
Passive-aggressive personality	17	13	18	5
Compulsive personality	8	3	3	1
Adjustment reaction of adolescence	26	13	38	20
Other	6	9	13	8

> (1) Can't study, or at least when I think I am studying, all I am doing is putting in time. I want to think about doing nothing. Just plain tired of school, yet don't want to stop. Difficulty in getting to sleep. Have been recently using drugs to sleep. Usually in the latter part of the week. A general feeling of uselessness—that what I am doing nobody cares about, and I am just about to quit caring. . . . I just can't go on like this. I feel miserable, and I am getting very disagreeable and upset at the most insignificant incidents. Anything in the way of quizzes or tests usually upsets me for the whole day. Probably the whole idea of my being here is upsetting. I don't know, or for that matter care, but then I do care in a way.
>
> (2) I have a lack of interest in school, life, etc. I seem to be a spectator to everything. Because of this lack of interest, I find it very difficult to force myself to study. Whenever an important decision comes up, I really have

> a tough time knowing what to do, and many times I am dissatisfied with the decisions taken. I have periods of extreme depression. Some days I feel fine, and other days I feel like everything goes wrong and nothing will ever get better.

Virtually none of the students who complain in this manner are failing in their academic tasks, and very few ask for a medical excuse to drop out of school. Each is struggling in his own way to cope with these problems, and is seeking psychotherapeutic help to continue doing so.

People who ask the help of the psychiatric service seem to be different from the rest of the student population (Tables 54 through 57). Benefited and unbenefited patients alike are different from their peers both at the start and at the end of their college careers. The users of the psychiatric service score significantly higher as freshmen on scales measuring such personality characteristics as flexibility, autonomy, imaginativeness, and esthetic responsiveness, and they score lower on authoritarianism. Interestingly enough, there is no significant difference in their scores on the Schizoid Functioning Scale, which measures bizarreness of thinking and social alienation, except among the unbenefited women students, for whom as freshmen there is a difference at the .10 level of confidence. The differences between patients and non-patients persist into their senior year.

One may interpret the differences in the freshman and senior scores to mean that people who seek out the psychiatric service possess a higher degree of psychological awareness and flexibility than their peers; they seem more able to admit that they have problems and to face up to them. (Some and perhaps many of the non-patients may be characterized not so much by the absence of trouble as by the tendency to deny problems, or to leave them unchallenged and unexamined at the price of greater rigidity and emotional flatness.)

The sources of the information we have been examining were real students struggling to adjust to a specific university environment. In order to give a human dimension to our data, let us examine two case histories—those of Mr. A and Miss Z—which may serve to illustrate the problems faced in some form or

TABLE 54

PERSONALITY INVENTORY SCORES OF BERKELEY FRESHMEN AND OF BERKELEY PATIENTS AS FRESHMEN
(Males)

	I *Berkeley Freshmen* (N = 1026)		II *Patients Benefited Freshmen* (N = 51)		III *Patients Not Benefited Freshmen* (N = 71)		*t tests comparing the difference between the means of the following groups:*		
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*I & II*	*I & III*	*II & III*
Social Maturity	50	(10)	54	(11)	56	(9)	••	••	n.s.
Impulse Expression	50	(10)	53	(10)	54	(9)	•	••	n.s.
Schizoid Functioning	50	(10)	52	(11)	52	(10)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Masculinity-Femininity	50	(10)	47	(11)	45	(12)	•	••	n.s.
Estheticism	50	(10)	54	(11)	57	(10)	••	••	n.s.
Developmental Status	50	(10)	56	(11)	55	(10)	••	••	n.s.
Authoritarianism	116	(26)	108	(26)	105	(28)	•	••	n.s.
Ethnocentrism	56	(21)	54	(21)	52	(22)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

•• Significant at the .01 level.
• Significant at the .05 level.
† Significant at the .10 level.

Table 55

PERSONALITY INVENTORY SCORES OF BERKELEY FRESHMEN AND OF BERKELEY PATIENTS AS FRESHMEN (Females)

	I		II		III		*t* tests comparing the difference between the means of the following groups:		
	Berkeley Freshmen (N = 852)		*Patients Benefited Freshmen* (N = 58)		*Patients Not Benefited Freshmen* (N = 83)				
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*I & II*	*I & III*	*II & III*
Social Maturity	50	(10)	54	(8)	56	(10)	••	••	n.s.
Impulse Expression	50	(10)	53	(8)	55	(9)	•	••	n.s.
Schizoid Functioning	50	(10)	52	(9)	52	(10)	n.s.	†	n.s.
Masculinity-Femininity	50	(10)	49	(11)	49	(10)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Estheticism	50	(10)	53	(10)	55	(10)	•	••	n.s.
Developmental Status	50	(10)	54	(10)	56	(10)	••	••	n.s.
Authoritarianism	113	(27)	108	(25)	97	(28)	n.s.	••	•
Ethnocentrism	50	(18)	51	(22)	42	(19)	n.s.	••	•

•• Significant at the .01 level.
• Significant at the .05 level.
† Significant at the .10 level.

Table 56

PERSONALITY INVENTORY SCORES OF BERKELEY SENIORS AND OF BERKELEY PATIENTS AS FRESHMEN AND SENIORS (Males)

	I		II		III		IV		V		*t tests comparing the difference between the means of the following groups:*		
	Berkeley Seniors		*Patients Benefited*				*Patients Not Benefited*						
			Freshmen		*Seniors*		*Freshmen*		*Seniors*				
	(N = 286)		(N = 18)[a, b]		(N = 18)[b]		(N = 24)[a]		(N = 24)				
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*I & III*	*I & V*	*III & V*
Social Maturity	57	(11)	55	(12)	63	(8)	54	(11)	61	(11)	•	†	n.s.
Impulse Expression	52	(11)	51	(11)	56	(12)	52	(9)	57	(11)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Schizoid Functioning	47	(11)	52	(11)	50	(10)	52	(11)	49	(12)	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Masculinity-Femininity	47	(13)	50	(9)	43	(10)	45	(10)	40	(13)	n.s.	•	n.s.
Estheticism	52	(12)	56	(11)	58	(11)	57	(11)	59	(12)	†	••	n.s.
Developmental Status	58	(11)	54	(11)	64	(9)	53	(11)	62	(10)	•	†	n.s.
Authoritarianism	96	(26)	108	(29)	83	(21)	108	(31)	96	(32)	•	n.s.	n.s.
Ethnocentrism	44	(18)	52	(22)	36	(14)	51	(23)	47	(22)	†	n.s.	†

[a] These are the students for whom we have both freshman and senior scores.

[b] For the Authoritarianism and Ethnocentrism scores of the benefited patients, N = 21.

•• Significant at the .01 level.
• Significant at the .05 level.
† Significant at the .10 level.

TABLE 57

PERSONALITY INVENTORY SCORES OF BERKELEY SENIORS AND OF BERKELEY PATIENTS AS FRESHMEN AND SENIORS (Females)

	I		II		III		IV		V		*t tests comparing the difference between the means of the following groups:*		
	Berkeley		*Patients Benefited*				*Patients Not Benefited*						
	Seniors (N = 265)		*Freshmen* (N = 16)[a]		*Seniors* (N = 16)		*Freshmen* (N = 30)[a]		*Seniors* (N = 30)				
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*I & III*	*I & V*	*III & V*
Social Maturity	58	(10)	57	(7)	67	(5)	57	(11)	62	(11)	••	•	n.s.
Impulse Expression	52	(11)	53	(8)	59	(7)	55	(7)	58	(9)	•	••	n.s.
Schizoid Functioning	46	(11)	51	(8)	48	(7)	53	(7)	50	(11)	n.s.	†	n.s.
Masculinity-Femininity	48	(10)	48	(11)	49	(6)	47	(9)	44	(12)	n.s.	•	n.s.
Estheticism	53	(10)	54	(9)	59	(8)	54	(10)	59	(9)	•	••	n.s.
Developmental Status	59	(11)	56	(8)	69	(6)	56	(9)	65	(11)	••	••	n.s.
Authoritarianism	89	(26)	101	(21)	70	(16)	97	(29)	78	(29)	•	•	n.s.
Ethnocentrism	39	(16)	47	(18)	30	(10)	40	(14)	35	(16)	•	n.s.	n.s.

[a] These are the students for whom we have both freshman and senior scores.

•• Significant at the .01 level.
• Significant at the .05 level.
† Significant at the .10 level.

another by the 493 unique individuals who came to the clinic from 1961 to 1965.

Mr. A was eighteen years old when he came to the university. He is a blond, well-built young man with a short haircut and a deep tan. He never smiles, but almost always scowls, moves slowly, and appears depressed. When he talks, he holds his hand over his mouth and turns his head away slightly. He came to Berkeley from a small California city, where he had been living with both parents and a younger brother. Both his mother and father had completed high school, but had gone no further with their education. A's father works in a factory, and his mother works as a medical assistant.

A feels that his early life was not particularly happy. His father was a severe disciplinarian with a "tremendous need to be right almost all the time." Because of his mother's interference and restrictiveness with regard to his dating during his last two years of high school, A had suffered a severe depression requiring psychiatric care. He had come to the university on an athletic scholarship. During his first semester, he lived in a rooming house, made very few friends, and did practically no dating. In his second semester, he joined a fraternity and began to participate in much of the social activity around the house. Sports and fraternity events took up most of his free time. In addition to the scholarship funds, A received money from his parents, and planned to work during summer vacations for extra money.

It was difficult to know what A's self-perception was during the first year. His research interviewer during that time saw him as pessimistic, bitter, covert, frightened, not very outgoing or giving, and markedly conservative. He seemed strongly resentful of being bossed, unless it was by someone with high status or prestige, in which case he would become extremely compliant. Other liabilities included a restricted childhood, overdependence on parents, a "jealous" mother (where girlfriends were concerned), and an authoritarian father.

When A was first seen by his research interviewer, he was felt to be a good candidate for long-term psychotherapy because he seemed so depressed. However, shortly after he pledged a fraternity, he began to go out with girls a little, had more interaction with members of his own sex, and made some adjustment to the academic side of school, although still handicapped by poor reading skills. During his second semester, A seemed more self-assured—less anxious and less depressed. He attributed his improvement to having joined the fraternity.

Following his return to school from summer vacation, he again felt depressed. This was thought to be related to his summer job, which had apparently been a very difficult one. He seemed genuinely pleased to get back to school, if for no other reason than to get away from his job situation. A had entered school hoping to earn a law degree. By the beginning of the second year, he had decided he was going to become a sociologist, although he sounded unsure about it. His interviewer had real doubts at this time about whether A was even going to make it through school, mainly because there was so much anger in him, and a great reluctance to do academic work. The interviewer felt, however, that A could probably benefit considerably from some kind of long-term investigation of himself.

A's second interviewer, who saw him in the fourth semester, felt that he was "somewhat phoney about his renunciation of the past." This interviewer felt that A was deceiving himself—that he was as socially withdrawn and self-centered as ever. "He spoke more as if he were in a trance than wide awake. His view of morality and sex expressed conservatism and restraint, and was further evidence of domination by rather than emancipation from his past."

Mr. A first came to the psychiatric clinic for help in December, 1961, between his first and second research interviews. His entering complaint was: "Lack of adjustment and good mental health, becoming cynical, becoming sacrilegious, periods of elation and depression, and sensitivity to the actions of others." For "recent upsetting occurrences" he wrote: "A trip home during Thanksgiving vacation and a realization of how I have changed, linked with memories I would do well to forget."

The admission note by the psychotherapist stated:

> An eighteen-year-old boy who is not too interested majoring in social sciences. He has been a rather isolated and not too involved person, who in his last year of high school became infatuated with what seemed to him to be his ideal girl. After going with him for a year, she

> dropped him. Since that time, he has lacked any zest in his life, and has not been able to pick up the threads in his life that were enjoyable to him before. He has spent a good deal of time mulling over his loss of her and comparing her with all the other girls he sees. Actually, this has passed its peak, and he now begins to find his voluntarily increased isolation unsatisfactory. A good number of his questions seem to be around whether he should try and engage more actively in life again. There seemed to be little need for any continuing therapy at this time and I told him so, as well as reassuring him about his tentative efforts to pick up the pieces.

The psychotherapist felt that A had somehow expected college life to change his isolation and give him social poise. He had been isolated and ill at ease in high school also.

> This young-appearing boy seems to have been greatly hurt and depressed by seeming rejection of first love, since she had become the guiding light in his beginning adult adaptation and identity formation. College is incidental to this, but he seems to be recovering and beginning to be ready to make use of the college environment. Above adult adaptation and identify formation appears delayed in this boy. There was no treatment at this time.

In 1962, Mr. A was seen twice at the Counseling Center—in September and in October. He was described as "verbalizing easily with a considerable number of slang expressions; rather adolescent, rebellious tone of voice, slightly effeminate." He came in specifically to take tests because he was thinking of going into law, and wanted to see if this was an appropriate choice. He said that the only thing he was good in was social science, with the exception of psychology or economics, which he had "tried" and not done well in. Political science was "out," because he did not like current events. He felt that he could make "a great living in either sociology or anthropology," though he really wondered about his choice. He knew he could not work in a social science because he would not want to teach. He also said, "I know I do not want to help people." Physical sciences were completely out because he could not understand math; and he could not consider the humanities, because he was "not a good writer," though he did like English and history. He said that he himself wrote poetry, and that he did not understand why so many people were "against poetry." He had never had anything published. He had never been able to write stories, because he could not develop a whole plot.

Because of outside commitments, A's grades had dropped perceptibly prior to his coming to the Counseling Center (he worked in the athletic department five hours a week). The fraternity house did not please him any longer, so he depledged and moved to an apartment with two other men— a student in physics and a student in engineering—who had also depledged from the fraternity. He asserted when discussing his roommates that practically everyone he met whom he liked was either in science or in engineering. He did not "cotton" to the few people he had met who were in the humanities or social sciences, because they seemed to be "beatniks." The counselor's impression was that A was a great deal more interested in the fine arts than he recognized or would admit. He had done some painting in the past, and said that this was the only thing he had really been able to ge involved in. He had taken one art course in high school, but had dropped out of it because he did not like the teacher. It had never occurred to him to take another one.

In the second interview at the Counseling Center, Mr. A admitted that he had thought of taking an art course but had decided against it, feeling that 17 units would be too much for that semester. There was some discussion about his writing. He recalled that he had been in a class for gifted children in high school, and that many of the other children could write so easily that he had always felt stupid by comparison. He imagined that people who went into the humanities had "enormous" backgrounds in literature, art, and music. He seemed to have a strong need for achievement, and spent some time talking about how "law" appealed to him because of the high regard in which it is held by society. He also admitted that he missed the social life of the fraternity. He had not dated recently. He disliked all his teachers, but had been working hard on his courses, and hoped to get at least a 3.0 average.

At the end of his second year, Mr. A left the Berkeley campus and registered at another University of California campus.

After leaving Berkeley, Mr. A answered three questionnaires for the Student Development Study. In the first questionnaire, in 1963, he asserted that the new campus offered a more relaxed, socially easy atmosphere than Berkeley did. There was, he said, more friendliness on the part of fellow students and a more pleasant classroom atmosphere. In response to the question: "If you were required to take only one-half of your courses, but were given full credit, what would you do with the half-time so freed?," he wrote: "(1) Socialize, drink, party, lay as many girls as possible; (2) read and listen to music." In response to the question: "Have your interests changed since high school? To what do you attribute these changes?" he wrote: "I like sports, movies, TV, and kissing less [than I did then]. I like reading, music, women, people, plays, drinking, and smoking more, with studying about the same as before." He attributed the change to an increase in maturity, to widening experience, and to age. He said that he had come to realize that "working for the grade and considering the knowledge gained as only secondary is an attitude that may not be very academic, but it is practical, especially in a cutthroat multiversity."

He now wanted to achieve "prestige, social stature, money, and a feeling of accomplishment" after graduation. If he had all the money he wanted, he said, he would become a "playboy," and would completely anesthetize his senses with physical and mental pleasures. "I realize I do not possess a great enough mind to leave any noticeable footprints in the sand. I also realize that 'when you're dead, you're dead, so live for the present.' " He stated that the first two college years had had absolutely no impact on him, apart from his courses; he had switched to sociology because it was an easier major.

Mr. A's answers to the next two questionnaires reflected his deep confusion. His jovial extroversion contrasted sharply with such statements as "There is intense loneliness underlying my conscious existence, realized most strongly when I am alone, particularly at night with only the ocean's rushing." To the question, "What do you do when you are alone?" he responded:

> I long for feminine companionship, become restless, spend hours writing poetry and an occasional short story, always romantic, or I listen to music, particularly

> Wagner, and lapse into technicolor reveries of what I imagine the music represents, becoming so emotionally enthralled that I weep and am wafted from the pinnacle of joy to the abyss of depression by the flowing notes and chords. I always feel lonely; it is suppressed only by study or feminine companionship or carousing. Daytime loneliness is ameliorated by talking to someone, but frequently it is incurable. Nighttime loneliness is cured by going to bed or increased by reveling in a poem I have written or am writing at the time. A Saturday night alone is horrible, and I greatly envy persons at parties. During intense periods of loneliness, the entire world of social convention seems shallow as a puddle of rain-water, and I am in the depths of despair.

Mr. A planned to get married after he got his degree; and he listed some of the requirements an ideal wife should possess. His girl must be very feminine, have polished nails, pretty hair, be effervescent, affectionate, and sensitive. She must cry as much when reading Fitzgerald's *Tender is the Night* as she would at a tragic opera. Above all, she must be submissive and dependent on him: "A union with a masculine, aggressive, unsensitive, or non-delicate girl would be as impossible for me as would one with a woman who was stupid, or who liked rock and roll music, or had majored in anything but the liberal arts."

In December 1964, he again responded to a questionnaire. At that time, he was living with a graduate student in an apartment near the campus. He was working toward a B.A. degree in a humanities subject, and planned to go on from there to acquire a teacher's credential, a law degree, or an advanced degree in history. He planned to stay away from his family. He felt he had acquired a large degree of stability during the semester just past, and also felt that his career plans were not as nebulous as they once had been. He described himself as follows: "I have been an eternal Shelleyesque idealist with aspirations transcending my mental potentialities. I shall always wallow in poetry, music, and art, but I realize the necessity of trying to support myself in this Protestant-ethic practical world. I still hold certain values that I shall not permit to be thwarted. There is an inherent value in the arts. Men pass on, but the footprints they leave behind are forever fossilized in the sand. Footprints are more important than corporations." Now "a hundred-per-cent independent," he was financially his own boss, and was paying for his own education. He claimed to feel no inferiority in comparison to his peers. To the question, "How often do you get depressed; what is it like; how do you handle it?" he responded: "I get depressed several times a week, usually when I have nothing with which to occupy my mind, or when I am alone, or when I receive a bad grade. I feel like immersing myself in a mist of forgetfulness. I go to bed."

Mr. A had had an unhappy childhood with a severe father and a jealous mother, but it is not clear why he came to the psychiatric clinic. Perhaps it was suggested to him by the research interviewers, or by a memory of previous psychiatric help. It is fairly clear from the record that he got no benefit from his visit to the psychiatric clinic; but he did seem to accept some of his more feminine impulses after interviews at the Counseling Center. Social deprivation seemed central to this young man's difficulties, although there was more than a hint of severe authority problems lurking in the background. From the last contacts with him, it seemed that his life had not changed much; and it is felt that he probably will have to seek help in the future, when acute crises related to authority conflicts or loneliness confront him.

Our second student, Miss Z, was described by her research interviewer as a slender blonde with braces on her teeth. When first interviewed, she was lightly made up and was wearing a becoming dress. Miss Z's father was a school administrator; her mother stayed home and kept house. Miss Z herself stated that she wanted to become a doctor, mainly because a doctor had done a great deal for her mother when she was suffering from an emotional problem. At the time, the interviewer was impressed with the student's apparent commitment, and noted that she sounded persevering. Miss Z also asserted that she wanted to get married, and hoped that she would be able to combine marriage and a career successfully. She felt that her father had little faith in her ability to succeed, but she herself seemed to have gained confidence and independence since she had been in school. She had been self-conscious and shy when she started at the university, but had become less so. She continued to be dependent on her family financially as well as emotionally, but also seemed to be dependent on her immediate friends. Essentially, she conformed to what was expected of her, trying to adapt herself to the group with whom she lived.

The research interviewer described her as friendly and honest, with good verbal facility and an openness to learning. He also saw her as intelligent, esthetic, and capable of emotion and close relationships, but overly dependent. He felt that the student was open to change, but feared that "she would be reluctant to let herself go—to indulge her impulses." Throughout the research interviews, Miss Z continued to persevere in her career goals. She did not feel that her moral convictions had changed since coming to school, except that she had become more tolerant of the opinions of others. She did not feel that her own opinions had changed much. She was politically apathetic, but was aware of the contradiction between her apathy and her belief in a democratic form of government.

The interviewer's summary stated that Miss Z impressed him as morally conventional, with a growing tolerance for others and a good chance for self-development. He doubted that her political indifference would change during her college years. She appeared to get some comfort from her religion, but did not seem to depend on it excessively. Much of her general lack of involvement struck him as the result of her determination to reach her career goal, medicine. There was a good possibility that she might enlarge her ideological world when she had enough time to give it some thought, and that she might be forced to make the time when she came into contact with the countless human problems a doctor must face.

After Miss Z's first interview during the junior year, her interviewer stated: "Z is bright, but is not intellectually engaged. She has one goal to accomplish, which is to become a doctor. She has only now discovered that she feels 'uncultured,' but she has no time at the moment to do much about it except to recognize it and let her boyfriend influence her. There are vast areas she will have time for only after she is through with medical school." The interviewer felt that acquiring a steady boyfriend was one of the more important things that had happened to Z, and that what was hindering her personal development most was her strong desire to enter medical school, which seemed to inhibit her vision of anything else. He felt that Miss Z appeared less attractive but happier since she had found a boyfriend. She had acquired other new friends, and appeared more at ease and secure. She had developed a genuine liking for music, art, and literature, but still felt obliged to become more cultured.

During her second interview in her junior year, Miss Z seemed to be even more self-confident and happy with her steady boyfriend. Her interpersonal life had been limited, and she had only one close friend other than her boyfriend. She felt that interpersonal relations would have to take second place to her goal of becoming a doctor. She was not very optimistic that marriage to her boyfriend would work out. She was looking forward to entering medical school the following year. At that time, her relationship with her boyfriend was close, but stopped short of intercourse, which she felt she would reserve for the man she wanted to marry (a sexual experience that had taken place in high school now seemed to her to have been "all wrong").

After Miss Z had been in medical school for a year, she was seen again by her interviewer. He felt that changes in her were taking place at a fairly rapid rate. Miss Z felt that she had developed greater independence, social ease, and a capacity for enjoyment. She was one of the few girls in her class of medical students, and was enjoying her studies. She hoped to marry eventually, but planned to go into practice before having children. At this interview, Miss Z looked more sophisticated, was attractively dressed, seemed sure of herself, was at ease, and appeared happy. She had lost some of her dependence and need for security, and did not seem as narrowly focused on career as she had been previously. She felt she had become less self-conscious, and gave credit for this to the psychotherapist she had seen at Cowell Hospital. She said that she now felt more free, and had intimate friendships with her fellow medical students. She was attracted to one of the male students, and had been having sexual intercourse with him, but was not "going steady." She had been able to take her studies much less seriously, was satisfied with B's and C's, and spent more time going to art shows and symphony concerts. Her interests had widened, and so had her external involvement in them. Her behavior seemed more flexible. The interviewer felt that Miss Z was one of the few students he had seen who had changed greatly while going to school: there had been so much healthy development that he felt sure that she could take care of her remaining conflicts, and eventually would be able to combine career, family, and other interests successfully.

Miss Z had been seen by two psychotherapists in the psychiatric clinic while she was an undergraduate. The first psychotherapist, who saw Miss Z four times, summarized the entering complaint as follows:

> Patient came in because her mother felt she should. Patient's mother had been upset by a letter the patient had written home. The substance of the letter was that the patient was not experiencing the hoped-for expansion of dating activities. During therapy, the patient focused primarily on the troubles of her parents. The mother had recently resolved a severe emotional problem, and was in therapy. The father had responded by becoming emotionally disturbed himself, and the patient somehow felt responsible for this. She was also missing her role of mediator between her parents. Very prominent was her overevaluation of psychiatry and her mother's psychotherapist, with much emphasis on how he had helped her mother—not apparently noting the influence on father. Patient expected to resolve dating problem. Had gone steady in high school, had broken up with her boyfriend as a senior, and did no dating thereafter. She expected new environment to change this. When it didn't happen, she complained to mother, who suggested therapy, and hinted at her expectation that the patient would act out sexually. The patient was infuriated at this.

Miss Z's responses to a questionnaire she answered after entering medical school fill out the picture. To the question, "How would you describe yourself, giving an uncensored and uninhibited picture of yourself?" she responded: "That is a task: physically attractive when I take care of myself, and I consistently do. Socially capable of handling any situation. If I handle it awkwardly, even that is charming, and usually is laughed at. Mentally capable of handling a large amount of mental exercise—probably more than I do. Since I have finally learned to be myself at all times and to love myself for what I am, I have some people who like me for what I am, and some who don't like me, and everyone is happy."

To the question, "How were you different when you entered college in 1961, and what accounts for this difference?" she replied: "If you look back in my records, you'll see a tremendous change. In 1961, I felt I was extremely homely and plain; that I was socially completely incompetent; and that I wasn't intelligent. How can I give any facts to account for the difference—three years of growing, longing to be myself, proving my capabilities? I could say finding 'the answer to life' if there is one, and I know there isn't—[learning] to be completely and consistently honest about the ugliness and sorrows of life as well as the beauties. When I was a sophomore, I talked several times with a psychotherapist at Cowell Hospital who pointed me in the right direction. My mother went through psychotherapy after an emotional breakdown in 1959, which may have helped too." To the question, "What changes have there been in the principles or rules by which you guide your conduct?" she answered: "I have discovered there are no right or wrong rules or principles. The only principles I hold are these: (1) True things are good things. (2) The most important aspect of life is communication with my fellow man. (3) I must always be myself no matter who wants me to be how." She summed it up by stating that she felt she had changed a great deal, but slowly.

Her second psychotherapist's description of her, taken from his notes after the first interview, said:

> Nineteen-year-old sophomore, slender, pretty features, braces on teeth, somewhat apologetic about coming, feared the therapist would feel she was wasting his time. Mother encouraged her to come, said patient didn't need to have as much trouble in college as she had. Mother is a real mother now, and easy to talk to since her psychiatric treatments. Mother says patient hasn't even shown anger toward her, and she thinks she should. Patient does feel some resentment now that her mother is more ambitious for her than she is for herself. Mother hoped she would be accepted at a prestigious private college, but the patient didn't care. Mother wanted her to join a sorority, though she told patient she was free to choose. Patient didn't, mother said O.K., but patient felt she was disappointed. Father is quiet, doesn't go in for small talk. His staff loves him. Student feels unable to communicate with him. Nothing she has to say feels

> quite as good as it should be. Unhappy that she isn't dating more.

A summary of the treatment by her therapist concludes: "Better able to know, reveal, and accept her own feelings. Happy relationship with new boyfriend. Aware of and critical of tendency to be scornful of the fact that his grades were lower than hers. She now wants to be in a service profession, as her father is. At end of semester, somewhat fearful of falling into the old patterns when she returns home, but feels she has some choice. May return for a few interviews in the fall."

At the final interview, Miss Z felt that she had benefited from her psychotherapeutic experience, and was subsequently less isolated, lonely, and depressed. Can it be this simple? Can a few hours with a psychotherapist have such a profound effect, when there is continual doubt in the literature that any psychotherapy, no matter how prolonged, has any effect? Some who have practiced college psychiatry for many years in such a setting as the one at Cowell Hospital are convinced that mutual exploration of difficulties at the appropriate time can change the direction of lives for the better very quickly.

But what of those troubled students who avail themselves neither of the psychiatric clinic nor of the Counseling Center? How do they handle their problems? In partial answer to that question, let us consider brief summaries of the careers of two non-patients, B and C.

B, a young man of eighteen, serious, attractive, well-dressed, and looking older than his years, came to the university from a small rural community. He hoped to become a teacher, and perhaps eventually a writer. He lived alone in an apartment, attended classes regularly, and did acceptable scholastic work. He had few acquaintances and no friends, and was frequently lonely and depressed.

When B was four years old, he left a toy on the basement stairs. His mother tripped on it, fell down the darkened stairs, and injured her back. She had been a chronic invalid ever since. No one in the family ever blamed B openly for the accident, but he received constant reassurances from the other members of the family that he would be "forgiven" by God if he remained a good boy henceforth. The mood of the family, a striving, hopeful, and rather happy one, changed from the day B's mother fell. The father and older brother manifested ill-concealed bitterness, and the mother became a whining complainer. Everyone felt deprived. The family had been moderately religious before, but following the accident, the church and God became almost compulsive solutions to even the most trivial of life's daily problems.

B was intelligent. During his early years, he complied unquestioningly with the family practices of home prayer and regular church attendance. He also read a great deal, mostly for solace and escape from an ever-present feeling that he had committed some great crime. By the age of eleven, he had carefully considered and firmly rejected all belief in God, but he continued to go through the motions with the family, fearful of their severe disapproval if he disclosed his secret convictions.

He finished high school successfully and came to the university in order to get as far away from his family as possible without leaving the country. His parents supported him in school, but he felt sure that they would withdraw their financial support if they knew he no longer attended church and was an unbeliever. He remained a "good boy" in the traditional family sense. He had very little social experience with members of either sex, and no sexual experience except for occasional masturbation, which made him feel guilty and somewhat of a failure. At the end of his second year in college, he left school and did not return.

C, a young man of the same age, serious, attractive, and colorfully but tastefully dressed, came to the university from a large city. He was shy, soft-spoken, and somewhat self-depreciating. He was not sure about what he would like to become, but had some vague ideas about going into television newscasting or acting. More secretly and fancifully, he dreamed of becoming a writer. His mother and father were both dead; they had lived apart since he was five years old. His father had gone to another state following the separation, but had returned to the home from time to time during the student's childhood. When the student was fourteen years old, he witnessed his mother's murder by one of her lovers. His father died about six months later, following an alcoholic spree.

The student had been an excellent scholar in grammar school and high school. He attributed this to his mother's example and exhortations. She had worked as a housemaid during the day, and had gone to night school to complete her high school education. She had hung her diploma on the living room wall for all to see. The student was sure that he was the first member of his family ever to have attended college.

In high school, he had been successful in all scholastic, social, and athletic endeavors. He had been elected student body president in his senior year. When he came to the university, he felt like an outsider. He attended classes, but made no friends and participated in no school activities. If it had not been for some of his old high school friends, who still hung on, he would have been virtually alone. He had dissociated himself from his "family," none of whom were very interested in his activities.

After the first year of college, C got a job in the bookstore. He began to feel a little more comfortable in the university surroundings, although he still had no friends, and participated in no school activities. By the beginning of the second undergraduate year, he had married his high school girlfriend. This helped assuage his loneliness. He did remarkably well scholastically throughout his four years, graduated at the head of his class, and received a coveted award and a number of scholarships to prestigious graduate schools.

Neither B nor C sought any professional help, although it was available and they could both have benefited from talking with someone. C admitted that he had thought of doing so from time to time, but had decided that psychiatric help would be useless because the doctor could not possibly understand a person of his social and cultural background. The first student refrained from seeking help mainly because he felt that no one could straighten out the real problems of his family relations or the bitterness of his childhood following his mother's accident, for which he still irrationally felt guilty. Like B and C, each student in our research study had his own "story." It is not at all clear why some came to the clinic and others did not. Yet it is amply clear that many who did not come needed help as much or more than those who did.

By the time a student reaches college, he is usually chronologically and physiologically an adult. It is primarily in his psychological and social growth that he is considered an adolescent or in transition to adulthood. Many writers in the educational and psychological fields have recently been listing the numerous tasks that college students must master if they are to be considered successful in their maturation: for example, achieving independence, dealing with authority, handling ambiguity, developing with regard to sexual matters, attaining prestige, and developing value systems.[8]

When something goes wrong and students seek help, they or their families are often held responsible for the difficulties, both by themselves and by others. One of the major presenting problems that students talk about with psychotherapists and counselors concerns a marked to moderate depression and an inability to do schoolwork. Of the 493 students in the class of 1965 who sought help, 34 per cent were struggling with this syndrome. Almost all explanations of depression and apathy point to them as ways of handling unacceptable aggression. The aggression is often described as a hangover from past family resentments, transferred to present situations. What ails these people? They seem to be achieving academically, but they are desperately unhappy. They complain about depression, and yet to an experienced psychotherapist, most of them do not seem pathologically depressed. Diagnoses of "depressive reaction" are much lower among them than complaints about depression. They have been called "the voluntarily compliant." They conceal from themselves that they are doing what they do not want to do. In the university environment, with its diversity of values, their need for the approval of their peers, their desire for status and self-esteem, and their fears of loneliness force them into conformity against their best interests and their own basic values. Clara Thompson differentiates them from the obviously "neurotic"—from those who suffer from a failure to adapt—and calls them the victims of "an anonymous cultural tyranny which subtly exacts submission as the price of success." [9] Erich Fromm writes about them extensively when he writes of the "marketing" orientation.[10] These students, like many older people, seem to suffer from the compromises they have made in order to adapt.

---

[8] Dana Farnsworth, in his recent book, *Psychiatry, Education, and the Young Adult* (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C Thomas, 1966), devotes his third chapter to an analysis of the developmental tasks of college students. He describes what, "ideally," college officials should strive for: "an environment in which students may learn how to acquire mature habits of thought and behavior, develop potential creativity, and learn to be independent without being unnecessarily offensive to those who may not agree with them." He asserts (and we wholeheartedly agree) that "to apply sanctions in a punitive manner at this period of development only perpetuates the [undesirable] behavior and makes the rebellion more intense, more painful, and more prolonged. Punitive action seems to justify the young person's resentment, and to postpone or prevent the acquisition of self-control."

In order to understand how psychotherapists can help such students, one must examine some of the underlying differences between the goals and methods of traditional education and that education or reeducation in self-knowledge and self-values called psychotherapy. In psychotherapy, there are no lectures. It is a one-to-one relationship in which a dialogue is expected and a human relationship is established. Much learning is by example, from a person who is trained and, in some cases, gifted in human living. Admission to the "course" is not based on previous "standards" of performance. Routine tests are not given, and there are no grades. No scholarships are available or necessary; no diplomas are conferred. Humiliations, indignities, blame, and other subtle or crude forms of punishment form no part of the modern psychiatric armamentarium. Advice is not given. Students are neither implored nor compelled to take this path rather than that, and psychotherapists do not appeal to force. For a majority of the students, this is probably the first time in their lives that they are able to talk about their problems with skilled professional adults who have no special self-interest, no axes to grind.

In a relatively short time, their potentialities are freed, and choices become possible again. For many, "What do you want to do?" becomes a meaningful question for the first time. In some of these cases, the students desire to take a leave from school after completing the semester. The pejorative term for such students is "dropouts." Others discover for the first time that they do not know whether they wanted to go to college at all, or were just trying to please parents, or at least not disappoint them badly. Others decide that another institution would better suit their needs. Some, of course, return after a certain time away.

---

[9] Thompson, Clara M. *Interpersonal Psychoanalysis*. New York: Basic Books, 1964. This problem is discussed in the chapter called "An Introduction to Minor Maladjustments."

[10] Fromm, Erich. *Escape From Freedom*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941, and *The Sane Society*. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1955.

In an article in the *Saturday Review*, October 16, 1965, entitled "Why Teachers Fail," B. F. Skinner briefly reviews the history of punishments, crude and subtle, in education. Professor Skinner feels that aversive control "is perhaps an achievement, but it is offset by an extraordinary list of unwanted byproducts traceable to the basic practice. . . . One of the easiest forms of escape is simply to forget all one has learned; and no one has discovered a form of control to prevent this ultimate break for freedom." He continues: "In college and graduate schools, the aversive pattern survives in the now almost universal system of 'assign and test.' The teacher does not teach: he simply holds the student responsible for learning." Knowledge of the objective world has indeed been the concern of our educational systems, but there has been insufficient interest in or concern with the teaching of knowledge of self and the relation of self to its human and non-human environment. Counselors and psychiatrists have done their share, but the teaching of self-knowledge is too important to be left solely to a small minority. It should permeate the entire educational process.

9

DRINKING AND PERSONALITY

Nevitt Sanford and Susan Singer

The investigation reported here was directed to the hypothesis that there are observable ways of drinking and abstaining, as well as attitudes, beliefs, and values with respect to drinking that are characteristic of the individual and can be ascribed to persistent dispositions of his personality. If this hypothesis is true, then we should expect changes in personality over the college years to be accompanied by changes in alcohol-related behavior. It does not follow, however, that changes in alcohol-related behavior can be attributed to change in personality; this is quite possible, to be sure, but as we shall see, such behavior is heavily influenced by social factors.

---

easy to
us that
determ
be ma
is extr
for the
ways i
sistenc
would
as Ver
related
situati
social

"perso
differe
a grou
its me
where
search
have i
able t
sponse
psycho
ality c
marke
and in
is no e
lem-in
those

that al
and ha

Nevitt S
Univers

(Ed.). A

From a practical viewpoint, our major hypothesis is not easy to demonstrate. Common sense and everyday observation tell us that on the part of non-problem drinkers, drinking is heavily determined by the situation of the moment. Little or nothing can be made of a single episode of drinking or abstaining, unless it is extraordinary in its social impact or is known to be very unusual for the individual. There is little reason for even asking about the ways in which personality factors are involved until some consistency of behavior over time has been observed; but even this would not be strongly indicative of personality involvement for, as Verden and other sociologists have shown, consistency of alchol-related behavior is often the result of the persistence of the social situation in which the individual lives, chiefly his membership in social groups within which he conforms.[1]

Still, there are considerations that lend plausibility to our "personality hypothesis." For one thing, there are large individual differences between drinkers. Whatever the drinking patterns of a group, it is always possible to discover various differences among its members. When subjects are administered alcohol in situations where an effort is made to control sources of variation, the researcher often becomes aware of large individual differences that have intervened to attenuate experimental effects. It seems reasonable to suppose that some of the differences in readiness for response that people bring to group drinking situations or to psychological experiments originate in relatively durable personality characteristics. Again, even people with alcoholism differ markedly in respect to when, where, what, and how they drink, and in their behavior during or following their drinking.[2] There is no evidence that persons whose drinking patterns are not problem-induced or problem-causing are categorically different from those who have problems.

Finally, there is the argument from anthropological studies that alcohol is used in radically different ways in different cultures, and has radically different meanings and symbolic values; and that these phenomena can be understood as expressions of the shared needs of the people in a given culture. An individual, no less than a culture, is capable of using alcohol in the service of his needs, however little or much these needs may be shared with other people. And he, no less than a culture, is capable of assigning meanings to alcohol; of using it to symbolize other objects or ideas; and of concocting fantasies and beliefs about it that accord with his way of looking at the world. Indeed, we may imagine that cultural patterns, like contemporary fads and fashions, begin in the brains of particular individuals who are trying to think of some way to make their lives more satisfying. Such patterns are no less unique for having been produced by a number of different individuals in similar circumstances at about the same time. Once such patterns have proved their usefulness in a community and have become integral parts of its structure and functioning, they are, of course, adhered to by many individuals whose motives are quite different from those of the innovators. However, those members of the culture with similar personality structures would presumably find similar meanings in drinking.

---

[1] Verden, Paul. "Alcohol in Contemporary American Society," in Nevitt Sanford (Ed.). *Alcohol Problems and Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968 (in press).

[2] Levin, Max. "The Nature of Problem Drinking." In Nevitt, Sanford (Ed.). *Alcohol Problems and Public Policy*.

The study of drinking behavior does not confront the student of personality with unique problems. That all observable behavior is in part determined by the situation of the moment, a situation that includes the individual's various group memberships, is a truism of personality theory. But it is also a truism that individuals manage to put their own stamp upon what they do, to express something of themselves in their behavior—so that an investigator, given a sufficiently broad sample of an individual's behavior, can make reasonably accurate inferences about his enduring characteristics.

To judge by the literature, the personality hypothesis seems not to have held much interest for psychologists in the past. Most of what we know about non-problem drinking we owe to sociologists and anthropologists who, incidental to their studies of the social and cultural determinants of drinking practices, have contributed observations on individuals. Some of these writers have gone so far as to delineate types of drinkers, differentiated primarily on the basis of consistent motivational trends. In a major theoretical paper, Jellinek gave considerable attention to how individual patterns of drinking or abstaining might be expressive of different personality needs.[3] But the great emphasis in all the studies reported is on the social situation, and on factors in the drinker's social background. Instead of relating observed drinking behavior or inferred motives for drinking to dispositions or other attributes of personality, and thereby increasing our understanding of the meaning of drinking to individuals, the authors focus on correlations between alcohol-related phenomena and a wide range of social factors, contemporary and historical.

In much psychological and social scientific work in recent years, personality tends to fall, as it were, between two chairs. Either it is fragmented, as in those experimental studies that focus on two or three variables, or else it is lost in a surround of supra-individual social processes, as in social-psychological studies of drinking behavior. In this light, it seems ironical that psychologists who are primarily interested in personality, and who have carried out intensive and comprehensive studies of personality, have neglected to inquire into the drinking behavior of their subjects. For example, in the Office of Strategic Services assessment studies published in 1948,[4] and in studies largely modeled after them that were carried out at the Institute for Personality Assessment and Research at Berkeley, a "drinking party" was included among the procedures, but the interest was mainly in whether there were problem drinkers among the assessees, and in whether there was anything to the idea of *in vino veritas*. There was no systematic inquiry into the details of the subjects' drinking practices, into the phenomenology of their drinking, or into their beliefs, attitudes, and values with regard to alcohol-related phenomena. The same is true of other assessment studies. One might say that even in a comprehensive three-day assessment study, the investigators cannot attend to everything. Probably a number of important areas of behavior were left out of account. Yet when one considers the enormously wide range of phenomena that were somehow covered, in questionnaires and in interviews, one is left with some suspicion that students of personality have participated in a conspiracy of silence about alcohol.

---

[3] Jellinek, E. M. "The Problem of Alcohol." In *Alcohol, Science and Society*. New Haven: *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcoholism*, 1945.

[4] Office of Strategic Services Assessment Staff. *Assessment of Men*. New York: Holt, 1948.

In order to add to our understanding of drinking in the context of personality, an investigator must be interested in both personality and non-problem drinking.[5] This seems to be a rare combination of interests; we have been able to find it in only two investigators. Emery (1960) suggests that beverage preferences may reveal dispositions of personality.[6] One hypothesis, which is presumed to hold in the absence of pathology, is "that preferences for sweetness in an alcoholic drink reflects a desire to seek an infantile kind of pleasure, and by implication, escape, in that respect at least, from reality." Preference for bitterness in a drink reflects a greater willingness to face up to reality and to meet it on its own terms. When these opposite taste preferences are combined with other qualities of the drink, three types of drinkers are hypothecated: the indulgent, the social (impulsive, acting-out), and the reparative. The last adjective describes a drinker who is steady, hard-working, reality-oriented, and desirous of putting back by means of his alcoholic beverage at the end of the working day what he gives out in his duty relations. The author concludes that "if the correspondence can be verified [between types of drinkers and their preferences in drink], the theory should offer a valuable means of exploring and predicting many other things about the drinkers of different drinks."

---

[5] There are, of course, many studies that have found differences in personality between problem drinkers and other people; for example, Button, A. D. "A Study of Alcoholics with the MMPI." *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 1956, *17*, 263–81; McCord, W., and McCord, Joan. *Origins of Alcoholism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960; Rosen, A. C. "A Comparative Study of Alcoholics and Psychiatric Patients with the MMPI." *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 1960, *21*, 253–66; and Singer, E., Blane, H., and Rasschau, R. "Alcoholism and Social Isolation." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1964, *69*, 681–89. Most such studies leave open the question of whether personality factors predispose to problem drinking or are, rather, effects of it. The McCords' study, however, using data on adolescent boys, some of whom later became alcoholic, produced evidence that personality problems, for example, a struggle with dependence, had a role in the etiology of alcoholism. Such evidence is in line with what has been suggested by numerous clinical studies, for example, Hanfmann, Eugenia. "The Life History of an Ex-Alcoholic, with an Evaluation of Factors Involved in Causation and Rehabilitation." *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 1951, *12*, 405–43.

[6] Emery, F. *Characteristics of Guiness Drinkers*. London, England: Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, 1960. Document No. 567 (mimeo).

Closer to our own work is that of Mary Jones, who, like Emery, set out to determine whether variations in drinking practices were associated with characteristics of personality.[7] The subjects were 66 men, members of the Oakland Growth Study, who had been studied intensively for seven years beginning in their tenth year, and who had taken part in follow-up studies at ages 33, 38, and 43. In the follow-up interviews at age 43, in 1964, Jones questioned the subjects carefully about their drinking, and on the basis of the information they gave, classified them according to the following amount-frequency scheme: (1) problem drinkers, (2) heavy drinkers, (3) moderate drinkers, (4) light drinkers, and (5) non-drinkers-abstainers. The California Q-sort was used for obtaining measures of personality attributes. The basis for the Q-sorts was a series of intensive interviews, averaging 12 hours overall, conducted when the subjects were age 38.[8] Ratings were made from the judgments of two psychologists. Numerous differences among problem drinkers, moderate drinkers, and abstainers were found. Concerning the moderate drinkers, Jones writes: "On the whole, ratings for being controlled, consistent, objective, moralistic, and ethical, with a high aspiration level, are above average for this group of men; but their position is midway between the problem drinkers in one direction and the non-drinkers in the other." [9]

In another part of the study, Jones shows that the differences in personality among her three groups of drinkers were already beginning to show when the subjects were in junior high school. During the early years of the Oakland Growth Study, when the subjects were ten-and-a-half to seventeen-and-a-half years old, they were given numerous tests of abilities, attitudes, and interests; they were interviewed, observed in various natural settings, and rated on personality characteristics. Parents contributed information on family background and home life, teachers reported on classroom behavior, and classmates gave their impressions. On the basis of this material, three psychologists sorted for each subject the 100 items in the California Q-sort: once for the junior high school period, and once for the senior high school period. It was found that 53 per cent of the 36 items that differentiated among the men in the three drinking categories in adulthood were also differentiating at the junior high school level, and 44 per cent were differentiating at the senior high school level. This is evidence that personality factors may predispose not only to problem drinking, as the work of the McCords indicated, but to other forms of alcohol-related behavior as well.[10]

---

[7] Jones, Mary. "Personality Correlates and Antecedents of Drinking Patterns in Adult Males." *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1968 (in press).

[8] Block, J. *The Q-sort Method of Personality Assessment and Psychiatric Research*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C Thomas, 1961.

[9] Jones. "Personality Correlates."

Our study of the relationship of drinking to personality among college students began in the summer of 1961, when the Institute for the Study of Human Problems was also beginning an intensive study of alcohol problems for the Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism. Accordingly, when plans were being made to administer a battery of tests to the entering freshman classes at Stanford and at Berkeley, it was natural to include items pertaining to alcohol. Fifty-four such items, written by Max Levin and Mary C. Jones, were included among the personality and attitude scales being used.

Fred and Zelda Strassburger used these 54 items in developing two 10-item attitude scales, one (Scale I) measuring favorableness of attitude toward social drinking, and the other (Scale II) tolerance or enlightenment of view with respect to "alchoholism and the alcoholic." [11] Examples of the items in Scale I are: "All things considered, drinking does people more good than harm" (True), and "It is best not to go around with people who drink" (False). In Scale II, "An alcoholic is an ill person" (True), and "A drunk makes me feel disgusted" (False). The scales had adequate internal consistency, and were validated by comparison with ratings of attitudes and drinking behavior made on the basis of freshman interviews with 92 Stanford freshmen and 102 Berkeley freshmen. The major findings of the Strassburger study were that freshmen who are favorably disposed toward the use of alcohol and have enlightened views on alcoholism score higher than others on the Social Maturity and Impulse Expression Scales.

---

[10] McCord and McCord. *Origins of Alcoholism.*

[11] Strassburger, Fred, and Strassburger, Zelda. "Measurement of Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Their Relation to Personality Variables." *Journal of Consulting Psychology,* 1965, *29,* 440–45.

The basic data of this study were obtained from 271 senior men and 213 senior women students at Stanford. These students filled out the Senior Questionnaire, which contained enough questions about drinking so that is was possible to classify the students according to a scheme that combined frequency of drinking hard liquor with frequency of being drunk.

Group 1. Abstainers: never drink, never drunk.

Group 2. Drinks, but doesn't get drunk: drinks daily, once or twice a week, or once or twice a month, but has not been drunk in the past year.

Group 3. Drinks seldom, but gets drunk: drinks once or twice a month, or once to twice a year, but has not been drunk more than once in the past year.

Group 4. Drinks frequently, and gets drunk: drinks daily, or once or twice a week, and has been drunk more than once in the past year.

For most of these students, scores on the following instruments were available: The Strassburger Scales I and II, for both freshman and senior years; the Omnibus Personality Inventory, six scales, for both freshman and senior years; the Ethnocentrism (E) Scale, for both freshman and senior years; the Authoritarianism (F) Scale, for both freshman and senior years; the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), for the freshman year; and selected items from the Senior Questionnaire.

We are thus in a position to relate scores on the Strassburger scales with various personality measures, and to compare subjects in the various categories of drinking behavior in terms of their Strassburger Scale scores as well as in terms of their scores on the personality measures. Because sex differences of some importance appear in the data, it seemed best to carry out separate analyses for the men and for the women. Correlations between scores on the Strassburger Scales and scores on the OPI, E, and F Scales are shown in Table 58. Also shown are the correlations found in the groups of freshman and senior men and women between Scale I and Scale II. Despite the fact that the scales have three items in common, and that one of these items scores in the opposite direction in the two instances, these correlations are not very high. This suggests that the scales actually measure somewhat different attitudes—an interpretation that is consistent with the fact that in some cases, their correlations with the personality measures are strikingly different.

TABLE 58

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN STRASSBURGER SCALES (S I AND S II) AND OPI, E AND F SCALES
STANFORD

	Freshman Women (N = 380)		*Freshman Men* (N = 773)		*Senior Women* (N = 123)		*Senior Men* (N = 162)	
	S I	S II	S I	S II	S I	S II	S I	S II
SM	.16 •	.39 •	.18 •	.38 •	.28 •	.44 •	.15	.35 •
IE	.25 •	.26 •	.34 •	.29 •	.28 •	.23 •	.30 •	.27 •
SF	.02	—.06	.10 •	.02	.05	—.01	.04	—.06
MF	—.06	—.03	—.04	—.08	.02	—.07	—.08	—.08
ES	—.02	.12	.04	.15 •	.20	.27 •	.04	.10
DS	.29 •	.43 •	.35 •	.46 •	.26 •	.41 •	.30 •	.47 •
F	—.10	—.30 •	—.13 •	—.33 •	.12	.11	.02	—.31 •
E	—.04	—.17 •	—.01	—.13 •	—.09	—.16	.08	—.20 •
S I		.44 •		.55 •		.35 •		.48 •
S II	.44 •		.55 •		.35 •		.48 •	

• Significant at the .05 level.

We may note first a confirmation of the Strassburgers' major finding: favorable attitudes toward drinking and non-punitive attitudes toward alcoholics go with higher scores on the Social Maturity (SM) and Impulse Expression (IE) Scales. Positive correlations of approximately the same order are found in all four groups of subjects. These findings are consistent with, and are to some extent bolstered by, the positive correlations between the alcohol scales and the Developmental Status Scale (DS), a scale correlated with SM and IE that measures maturity, flexibility, sophistication, tolerance, and acceptance of impulses.

In all the groups of students, Social Maturity correlates more highly with Scale II than with Scale I. The SM Scale was derived from the F Scale, which, in all the groups but one, is correlated significantly with Scale II, but is in no group correlated with Scale I. It may be suggested that in a drinking culture (the Strassburgers have reported that in their sample of Stanford freshmen, 78 per cent of the men and 77 per cent of the women were users of alcohol), we should not expect to find much opposition to drinking on the part of authoritarian subjects, but that with regard to alcoholics—a group that is deviant or "different," a group that might be blamed for their condition—the authoritarian tendencies toward stereotyped thinking, rigid moralism, and punitiveness might be expected to come to the fore.

Mean scores on Scales I and II of freshman and senior men and women grouped according to drinking pattern are shown in Table 59. First to be noted here is a sex difference in the way the subjects are distributed among the drinking categories. For men, the modal pattern is to drink and to get drunk occasionally, whereas for the women, the modal pattern is to drink but not to get drunk. Comparatively few of the women either abstain or drink frequently and get drunk.

The Strassburgers suggest, on the basis of studies of interview protocols, that many women swim with the tide on questions of social drinking, allowing their drinking behavior to be determined by the climate of opinion or by the particular occasion. It is as if alcohol did not mean as much to them personally as it does to men. That so small a proportion of the women abstain is not surprising, when considered in the light of the survey made by Straus and Bacon, who found that although only 46 per cent of the females and 69 per cent of the males in their large sample of students in various colleges were users of alcohol, the proportions were approximately the same at private, nonsectarian schools like Stanford.[12] Also, there is evidence that there has been more drinking among young people during the 1960's than there was in 1953, when Straus and Bacon conducted their survey.

The data in Table 59 also show that the reported drinking behavior of our subjects was consistent with their attitudes toward drinking and alcoholism. For senior men and women, scores on both Scale I and Scale II increase directly with frequency of reported drinking and drunkenness; the same tendency was also found in freshmen. In freshmen as well as in seniors, men and women abstainers were significantly less sympathetic toward drink-

---

[12] Straus, R. and Bacon, S. *Drinking in College*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1953.

SCORES ON STRASSBURGER SCALES I[a] AND II[b] FOR STANFORD MEN AND WOMEN AS FRESHMEN (1961) AND SENIORS (1965)

STANFORD MEN

	Abstain		*Drink—never drunk*		*Drink occasionally—drunk more than once*		*Drink frequently—drunk more than ten times*		*Significant difference between groups* ($p < .05$)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1961	(N = 33)		(N = 31)		(N = 70)		(N = 48)		
S I	2.67	1.49	4.77	1.73	4.56	1.98	5.48	1.97	I–II, I–III, I–IV, III–IV
S II	4.21	1.58	6.58	2.00	6.79	1.78	7.06	1.98	I–II, I–III, I–IV
1965	(N = 2)		(N = 17)		(N = 44)		(N = 30)		
S I	3.86	1.70	5.76	1.09	6.64	1.22	6.80	1.24	I–II, I–III, I–IV, II–III, II–IV
S II	5.82	2.04	7.76	1.30	8.30	1.37	8.57	1.30	I–II, I–III, I–IV, II–IV

STANFORD WOMEN

	Abstain		*Drink—never drunk*		*Drink occasionally—drunk more than once*		*Drink frequently—drunk more than ten times*		*Significant difference between groups* ($p < .05$)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1961	(N = 6)		(N = 58)		(N = 34)		(N = 13)		
S I	3.50	0.55	4.28	1.68	4.94	1.56	4.15	1.63	I–III
S II	5.33	1.86	6.76	1.81	7.64	1.86	6.61	1.85	I–III
1965	(N = 6)		(N = 34)		(N = 23)		(N = 10)		
S I	4.00	1.10	5.94	1.46	6.04	1.22	6.60	1.26	I–II, I–III, I–IV
S II	7.00	1.67	7.85	1.40	8.17	1.30	8.20	0.63	I–IV

[a] Attitude toward social drinking (high score means favorable).

[b] Attitude toward alcoholism (high score means favorable).

ing and toward alcoholics than students reporting various patterns of drinking were. In all groups of abstainers and drinkers, the mean scores of seniors on the Strassburger scales are higher than those of the freshmen.

The mean personality scale scores—OPI, F, and E—of subjects in the four drinking categories are given in Table 60. What first strikes the eye here is the fact that abstainers are a very distinctive group. Male and female abstainers, both as freshmen and as seniors, score lower than drinkers on Social Maturity, Impulse Expression, and Developmental Status; these groups of abstainers are also higher on Authoritarianism, though it is only in the female group that the differences are statistically significant. These results are consistent with those involving the Strassburger scales, and serve to give a picture of the abstainer as relatively moralistic, constricted, and unsophisticated. This picture is similar to that which emerged when Jones applied the Q-sort technique to the adult abstainers in her study: they were distinguished from problem drinkers and moderate drinkers by being more overcontrolled, emotionally bland, fastidious, introspective, moralistic, considerate, and giving.[13]

Among the drinking groups, we find, as might be expected, that men who drink frequently and get drunk are higher on Impulse Expression than men who drink but are never drunk. But here the women veer off in a different direction. Both as freshmen and as seniors, women who drink occasionally and get drunk not only score higher on Impulse Expression and Developmental Status than those who drink without getting drunk—a finding not inconsistent with the findings for men—but they score higher than those who drink frequently and get drunk do. One clue to the meaning of this finding may be found in the fact that women who drink occasionally and get drunk score highest on Schizoid Functioning; this suggests that they are conflicted, and have difficulty both in accepting and in controlling their impulses. Another interpretation is suggested by what was said earlier about women swimming with the tide: women who drink frequently may simply be the most "social," in the sense that they have many dates and often find themselves in situations where drinking is the order

---

[13] Jones, "Personality Correlates."

TABLE 60

PERSONALITY SCALE SCORES OF STANFORD MEN AND WOMEN STUDENTS IN FOUR DRINKING GROUPS

STANFORD MEN

	I		II		III		IV		*t ratios between*			
	Abstainers		*Drink—never drunk*		*Drink occasionally—drunk more than once*		*Drink frequently—drunk more than 10 times*					
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	I–II	I–III	I–IV	
	(N = 36)		(N = 33)		(N = 73)		(N = 52)					
Freshmen [a]												
SM [b]	46	12	52	8	50	9	50	11	2.37 *	2.04 *		
IE	44	9	47	10	50	9	51	10		2.91 **	3.51 ***	
SF	50	9	48	11	49	10	50	10				
MF	53	11	47	11	49	10	50	10				
Es	52	11	52	9	49	10	49	11				
DS	44	11	48	7	51	10	51	10		3.56 ***	3.40 **	
F	116	28	110	20	110	22	109	21				
E	53	18	50	17	53	17	55	19	I–III	I–IV	II–IV	III–IV
Seniors	(N = 24)		(N = 20)		(N = 46)		(N = 31)					
SM	52	12	58	8	59	9	59	9	2.65 *	2.64 *		
IE	46	10	50	9	52	9	57	9	2.85 *	4.37 ***	2.81 **	2.34 *
SF	46	10	44	10	45	9	49	9				
MF	49	13	50	10	47	9	45	12				
Es	52	13	53	11	53	10	52	10				
DS	51	12	56	9	60	9	64	9	3.51 ***	4.50 ***	3.13 **	
F	98	29	98	28	96	23	88	28				
E	43	16	46	19	45	14	42	18				

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

[a] Scores were also computed for those freshmen for whom we have both freshmen and senior responses (Men N = 118, Women = 78). Their scores are nearly the same as the scores of students reported here (Men N = 194, Women = 121), about a third of whom did not respond to the senior test.

[b] SM = Social Maturity, IE = Impulse Expression, SF = Schizoid Functioning, MF = Masculinity-Femininity, Es = Esthetic Sensitivity, DS = Developmental Status, F = Authoritarianism, E = Ethnocentrism. The first six scales are reported in standard scores, F and E in raw scores.

TABLE 60—Continued

TABLE 60—Continued

PERSONALITY SCALE SCORES OF STANFORD MEN AND WOMEN STUDENTS IN FOUR DRINKING GROUPS

STANFORD WOMEN

	I *Abstainers* Mean	SD	II *Drink—never drunk* Mean	SD	III *Drink occasionally—drunk more than once* Mean	SD	IV *Drink frequently—drunk more than 10 times* Mean	SD	*t ratios between* I–II	I–III	II–III	III–IV
	(N = 7)		(N = 61)		(N = 36)		(N = 14)					
Freshmen [a]												
SM [b]	45	8	52	10	50	12	50	6				
IE	49	6	48	9	56	8	49	7			3.98 ***	2.71 **
SF	54	5	49	9	55	8	49	9			2.95 **	1.96
MF	49	10	49	10	50	12	50	11				
Es	54	8	51	10	47	12	51	10			1.98	
DS	43	7	49	11	55	9	47	5		3.18 **	2.38 *	2.84 **
F	120	22	101	22	104	25	109	14	2.14			
E	51	19	49	14	45	16	45	15				
Seniors	(N = 6)		(N = 37)		(N = 25)		(N = 10)		I–II	I–III	I–IV	II–III
SM	50	8	59	10	58	11	58	8	2.24 *		2.09 *	
SF	44	7	44	8	52	10	57	10	2.60 **	4.21 ***	3.10 **	3.58 ***
IE	43	5	51	9	61	10	48	12				3.10 **
MF	49	9	49	10	48	11	52	11				
Es	49	6	54	9	50	13	53	11				
DS	50	6	60	10	67	10	62	9	2.27 *	3.64 ***	2.59 *	2.26 *
F	112	22	89	25	91	27	89	22	2.13 *			
E	50	14	39	15	44	20	39	14				

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

[a] See Note a, preceding page.
[b] See Note b, preceding page.

of the day. This is conventional behavior for Stanford women; it may well be that those who drink only occasionally but get drunk find more pleasure and meaning in their drinking—drink more like men, we might say—in which case, we should expect them to be more "impulse-expressive" and sophisticated.

Mean California Psychological Inventory (CPI) scores were calculated for freshmen in the various drinking groups. In the case of males, abstainers scored lower than drinkers on dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, self-acceptance, and flexibility, and higher on responsibility, socialization, self-control, and femininity. Here again the abstainers stand out as being shy, retiring, socially uncomfortable, controlled in behavior, and rather rigid in their thinking. Among the three drinking groups, those who did not get drunk scored higher than those who did on measures of responsibility, socialization, capacity to make a good impression, and achievement through conformance, which suggests that this group drinks when it seems appropriate, but with much caution.

Female abstainers scored significantly lower than the drinking groups on social presence, achievement through independence, and flexibility, which indicates that they tend to lack social poise and are conforming and rigid in their thinking. The most deviant group on the CPI (as on the OPI) was the group of women who drink infrequently but do get drunk. Compared to the large group of women who drink often but do not get drunk, this group is significantly lower in dominance, sociability, sense of well-being, responsibility, socialization, communality (responding to items as the majority of subjects do), achievement through conformance, independence, intellectual efficiency, and femininity. Compared to the women who drink frequently and get drunk, these infrequent drinkers who get drunk scored lower on sociability, socialization, self-control, good impression, and achievement through conformance. These data substantiate the hypothesis suggested by the OPI results, that the women who drink seldom but do get drunk are a troubled, conflicted group, not quite in control of themselves, and also perhaps ashamed of behavior that they feel they ought to control. The large group of women who drink often but do not get drunk seem to be following an expected and acceptable pattern that enables them to adapt smoothly to social demands. The women who drink often and get drunk now and then do not seem to feel troubled or conflicted about their behavior. As we have suggested, they seem to be acting well within the limits of conventional behavior at Stanford.

The four drinking groups differed in their responses to a number of the Senior Questionnaire items. Usually the abstainers, or the abstainers and those who drink without getting drunk, differed from the groups who drink and get drunk. The important dimension here seems to be strength of impulse and degree of control: the heavier drinkers have more fun; the non-drinkers are somewhat constrained. In general, senior men who drank and got drunk were more social, more influenced by peers, more permissive about sex, had more intimate sexual relationships, more physical complaints, and more periods of depression than non-drinkers. Abstainers (and, to some extent, controlled drinkers) were less sociable, less influenced by peers, less permissive about sex, more inhibited in sexual behavior, and more religious. The three groups of drinkers differed in some of their reasons for drinking. Those who got drunk said more often that drinking relaxed them and made them feel confident, and that they especially liked to "get high" and to drink on dates. Those who did not get drunk attributed less importance to these reasons for drinking.

In the case of women, abstainers indicated the least amount of participation in social activities, the greatest involvement in church activities, the greatest frequency of prayer, and the least change in moral values during college. Compared with women drinkers, they indicated that they had more frequent conflict with girlfriends and less conflict with adults in authority. They were more opposed to premarital sexual relationships, and had a lower degree of sexual intimacy than those who drank.

The women who reported drinking seldom but getting drunk devoted the least time to church activities and were the least inclined to pray. They were the most affected during their college years by problems in their own families and by problems and conflicts in themselves: 17 per cent had drinking problems in their immediate families, in contrast to 6 per cent for the group who drank without getting drunk, and none for the abstainers and frequent drinkers. Of the four groups, they indicated the most frequent conflict with adults in authority. They were the most permissive regarding premarital sexual relationships; they had the greatest amount of sexual intimacy, but also the greatest conflict over sexual impulses. More often than the other women, they said that drinking helped them feel more confident. In general, the questionnaire data support the impression gained from the personality measures that the women in this group were troubled and conflicted—unable to accept or to suppress their impulses. Perhaps they were in a period of flux, when their values and self-concepts were changing.

The women who reported drinking frequently and getting drunk were characterized by much social activity, early physical development, and fairly high sexual intimacy attended by some conflict. They said they drank on dates, on special occasions, and for relaxation. Many of them (93 per cent) knew someone with a drinking problem, but none had a drinking problem in her immediate family. This is probably a sociable, fun-loving group of young women who grew up earlier than their peers.

In summary, our data indicate that drinking behavior, crudely described in terms of frequency and amount, as well as attitudes toward drinking and toward alcoholism, are related to personality characteristics. Where drinking is the norm, abstainers —both male and female—stand out as a relatively rigid, intolerant, and immature group. For men students, the modal pattern is to drink and get drunk, and the students who follow this pattern tend to be the most self-accepting, tolerant, and socially mature group. Among women, however, the modal pattern is to drink often but not to get drunk—to go along with the group, but to maintain self-control. There is a rather small group of sociable, self-accepting young women who drink often and do get drunk, but there is a larger group of troubled and conflicted women who drink seldom and get drunk. Control seems to be a more important issue for women than for men, with the women less able to permit and enjoy expression of impulse.

In all groups of male and female drinkers and abstainers, seniors score higher than freshmen on the two Strassburger scales. Differences on particular items show something of the contrasting frames of mind of entering and graduating students. In the following examples, figures in the columns indicate the percentage of students answering "Yes."

TABLE 61

STRASSBURGER SCALE ITEMS
(FIGURES INDICATE PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS ANSWERING "YES")

	Men		*Women*	
Item	*Freshmen*	*Seniors*	*Freshmen*	*Seniors*
(3) On a date, it is up to the girl to set the standards in regard to drinking behavior	19	16	76	47
(5) Most people drink because of personal problems	38	15	32	19
(6) All things considered, drinking does people more good than harm	15	32	9	19
(7) I resent people who preach the evils of drink	45	57	45	66
(12) People with a purpose in life have no need for alcohol	63	30	51	16
(13) People with adequate morals cannot become problem drinkers	31	11	26	8
(19) It is best not to go around with people who drink	44	13	41	9
(26) Most teenagers drink merely to defy authority	69	65	76	74
(34) Only people with weak characters drink to excess	37	17	28	7
(36) The law should permit serving liquor to eighteen-year-olds	42	69	34	70
(38) I have gotten away with buying a drink when I was under the legal age limit	32	71	28	76
(49) College students should be allowed to drink as often and as much as they like	28	68	20	66
(52) An alcoholic is an ill person	88	92	93	92

Not only are seniors more favorable toward drinking in general (Items 6, 36, 38, and 49 particularly) and toward freedom of choice for the individual (Items 7, 36, and 49), but they are more straightforward in reporting their own drinking behavior (Item 38) and less given to moral rigidity (Items 12, 13, 19, and 34). They are more confident of their ability to control themselves (Item 3, women particularly), and generally more knowledgeable and sophisticated (Items 5, 12, 34). Although freshmen as well as seniors think of alcoholism as an illness (Item 52), the former are much more likely, nonetheless, to see it as a moral failure. This is by no means the only instance of inconsistency in the thinking of freshmen. Very few believe that drinking does more good than harm, but there is nonetheless relatively strong resentment of people who preach its evils. Freshmen rather overwhelmingly believe that most teenagers drink merely to defy authority, but relatively few of them believe that college students should be allowed to drink as they please. Revealed here, it seems, is an important aspect of the freshman's developmental status: he has conflicts about authority, not being quite able to do with it or to do without it; while striving for independence, he nevertheless wants authority to be there in case he needs it. Seniors are not altogether free of this conflict, but they are more consistent: their opposition to authority is even stronger than that of the freshmen, and they expect teenagers to defy it; but they do not ask for external controls of their behavior in college.

It was possible to categorize the reported frequency of drinking of Berkeley seniors according to a scheme that is essentially equivalent to that used in the Strassburger ratings. Here is a comparison in these terms of Berkeley freshmen and Berkeley seniors. Men and women are treated separately.

Table 62

DRINKING HABITS OF BERKELEY MEN AND WOMEN

	Men				*Women*			
	Freshmen		*Seniors*		*Freshmen*		*Seniors*	
	N	*Per cent*	*N*	*Per cent*	*N*	*Per cent*	*N*	*Per cent*
Abstain	25	39	18	6	17	32	21	9
Drink occasionally or infrequently	24	38	37	15	22	41	49	22
Drink moderately	14	22	98	39	14	26	106	47
Drink heavily or frequently	1	2	97	39	0	0	51	22

In the case of one category, abstaining, the data may be supplemented by data from Stanford. The Strassburgers reported that 78 per cent of the Stanford men and 77 per cent of the Stanford women were users of alcohol. Taking these figures in conjunction with the Senior Questionnaire, we find that the percentages of abstainers in the freshman and senior samples of men are 22 and 19 respectively; in the samples of women, 23 and 8 respectively. These data make sense and are generally in accord with what might be expected. Let us consider first the case of abstainers. At Berkeley, a relatively high proportion of the men, 39 per cent, arrive at college without having begun to drink. Most of them are introduced to alcohol at some time during their college careers. The same trend is to be observed in the case of the women, though there are fewer abstainers among them at the beginning of college. This is what we might expect: young people of conservative or religious backgrounds with more or less protected upbringings become "liberated" at college, or at least adapt themselves to the prevailing standards of the college community. It has often been noted by observers at Berkeley that the men students come from more varied socioeconomic backgrounds than the women do, a fact which may well explain the sex differences in rates of abstainers.

But what about Stanford, where the proportion of abstainers is almost as great among senior men as among freshman men? Here it is suggested that since the great mass of these students comes from families of relatively high socioeconomic status, those who are going to drink begin to do so while they are still in high school. The persistent abstainers are therefore a distinctive group, as their personality test scores have indicated. To explain the differences between Berkeley and Stanford men, we may make use of the distinction drawn by the Strassburgers between "militant" and "tolerant" abstainers. Of the twenty-five abstainers in the Berkeley freshman sample, only three were classified as militant. At Stanford, on the other hand, clinical evidence indicates that the great majority of the freshman abstainers were militant, and that they stuck to their guns throughout their college careers. Typically, these young men came from homes in which there were religious scruples against drinking; they had apparently accepted their family values fully, and they remained oriented toward their families throughout the four college years. They had their minds made up about their future careers when they arrived at college, and they focused upon their work, allowing themselves to be influenced little by their peers or by the general culture of the college. Their relatively high scores on F (Authoritarianism) and E (Ethnocentrism) and their relatively low scores on SM (Social Maturity), IE (Impulse Expression), and DS (Developmental Status) changed little during college.

With women, on the other hand, the story is different. There were no more militant abstainers at Stanford than there were at Berkeley. Indeed, it is extremely rare to find among women at either of these institutions exhibiting such grim, family-supported, achievement orientation as that just described in the case of men. Drinking is not as much of an issue with them as it is with the men. Some arrive at college without having begun to drink, having been brought up, we may imagine, in abstinent homes or otherwise protected environments, but most of them soon adapt themselves to the culture of the college, and drink enough to meet the demands of conformity, but not enough to find in drinking an important means for the release of impulses.

Concerning the categories of drinkers, we find in both men and women a change in the general direction of greater frequency of drinking: fewer subjects drink occasionally and infrequently, more drink moderately or frequently. This result is consistent with our findings concerning the personality correlates of attitudes and practices respecting alcohol. Greater frequency of drinking, like more liberal attitudes toward drinking and alcoholics, is associated with higher scores on Social Maturity, Impulse Expression, and Developmental Status; these personality variables increase during the college years, and so does the frequency of drinking. Both of these kinds of changes are, we may suppose, indications of the liberating effects of the college experience.

Here it must be noted that the changes that take place in students during the college years are rarely very radical, and generally they are congruent with the students' precollege personalities. We have noted that in freshmen as well as in seniors, personality variables are correlated within attitudes and practices respecting alcohol, and that the attitudes and practices of seniors are correlated with personality variables measured when they were freshmen. This is consistent with Jones's finding that the personality dispositions associated with particular drinking practices in adults are continuous with dispositions observed when these subjects were in junior high school.[14] The general rule seems to be that subjects change in their absolute scores on personality measures, but still tend to retain their positions relative to other subjects. Our senior abstainers, who are high on the F Scale as freshmen, are not quite so high as seniors, but they are still higher than most other subjects. Again, students who are high on the Impulse Expression Scale as freshmen are likely to be drinking with some frequency, and during college both their IE scores and the frequency of their drinking are likely to increase—hence there is a correlation between IE and frequency of drinking in seniors as well as in freshmen.

Let us now consider the implications for action of findings such as those we have reported. What should teenagers be told about drinking and alcoholism? What should the position of the college administration be with regard to drinking among its students? There are wide differences of opinion in our society concerning these relatively simple questions; and discussion of them is troublesome, because we as a society have not worked out any generally agreed-upon standards governing the use of alcohol. What is needed is an evaluative scheme based on the various contexts and meanings of drinking and abstaining, and on their implications for long-range social and individual developmental goals.

The results of our study could become the basis for some first steps toward the development of such a scheme. But merely to raise the question of action is to expose the deficiencies of the work we have reported. For one thing, our categories for describing behavior with respect to alcohol, though far from being meaningless, lack sensitivity and subtlety. Abstaining, for example, appears to have different meanings and different implications for action in different cases. It is correlated with authoritarianism, and authoritarianism is generally considered to be a mark of failure, or at least of delay, in personality development. Should we then regard abstaining as something that college students should get over as soon as possible? Hardly, for one can easily find abstainers who are not authoritarian. Presumably, such an abstainer would be less

---

[14] Jones. "Personality Correlates."

"militant" and perhaps freer of inner conflicts about the question of drinking than his more authoritarian counterpart. It is much the same for the several categories of drinking: "heavy" drinking, for example, is associated with higher scores in Impulse Expression, a variable that generally increases as students go through college, and is usually taken as a sign of progress toward maturity; but as we all know, heavy drinking sometimes turns into problem drinking. We are left with the important practical question of how to judge the significance of particular patterns of heavy drinking.

To gain an indication of how far we still have to go, we need only consider what has been reported from clinical investigations of individuals with drinking problems. The psychoanalytic literature contains many reports in which alcohol-related behavior is shown to be dependent upon underlying personality needs and conflicts: one man's problem drinking is said to be an expression of an unconscious fantasy of being reunited with the mother of his infancy; another man becomes intoxicated in order to make possible the indulgence of homosexual needs; another uses the same device in order to express hostility toward his restricting mother-wife; a woman's problem drinking is an acting out of her unconscious identification with her alcoholic or delinquent father; and so on. If these psychoanalytic formulations are valid, they are of considerable significance, for we cannot believe that the personality functioning of problem drinkers is categorically different from that of ordinary drinkers.

When people who are not problem drinkers are studied carefully, as in the course of psychotherapy undertaken because of symptoms or complaints apparently unrelated to drinking, it is possible to see that personality processes and drinking practices are related in ways not unlike those found in problem drinkers. One of us treated, in psychoanalysis and in psychoanalytic psychotherapy over a period of nearly three years, a young woman social worker who presented at the beginning a variety of symptoms including frigidity, but who drank abstemiously and only occasionally. During the course of the psychotherapeutic work, she developed a pattern of dependence on beer and coffee, switching from one to the other and arranging her life so that during her waking hours she was never without the felt effects of one or the other substance. This pattern, it seemed, was expressive of her deepest conflict. On the one hand, she wanted to tear off, devour, possess totally, some source of life and power, be it her mother's breast or a man's penis; and on the other hand, she wanted to be sweet and good, full of love and loved fully, free of all aggressive impulses. Beer enabled her to achieve something of this latter state; it allowed her to feel for a time warm, comfortable, and loved (another effort in the same direction was her restricting herself to soft foods; biting or chewing made her unbearably anxious). If the drinking continued, these good feelings began to give way to feelings of helplessness, stupidity, and passivity, which meant for her giving up her masculine strivings and all hope of success and power. She needed coffee to make her snap out of it. Coffee could for a time make her feel alert and ambitious, and she could then do some work, but pretty soon the destructive impulses would be aroused, anxiety would begin to well up, and she would go back to beer. One can see how beer served her purposes better than wine or spirits; it gave the needed sense of fullness, and permitted her to prolong the feeling of goodness.

It is safe to say that the meaning of beer-drinking for this young woman was quite different from that found in other cases. But there would appear to be nothing unique or pathological about her capacity and inclination to assign personal meaning to drinking—to give it symbolic value and thus to use it as a means of expressing personality needs. This seems to be a general human tendency. The pathology in her case did not lie in the fact that infantile needs were expressed in drinking behavior. Rather, it was involved with the intensity of our patient's conflicts, and with the fact that they led to rigidity of personality—a state of affairs in which major strivings were unconscious, or were not in communication with the conscious ego. One might say that her way of managing her conflicts was not the worst that could have been contrived. She might have acted out her aggressive impulses and her dependence in overt behavior, with painful or highly annoying consequences for other people, and serious consequences for herself.

Clinical studies of individuals in trouble, though they have so far been the major source of our knowledge about the relations of drinking to infantile needs and the unconscious process, are certainly not the only source of understanding of the place of drinking in the overall functioning. Much can be found out from research interviews that are focused on drinking and guided by theory. The following cases of two brothers, taken from Jones, show how different in meaning and implications "heavy" drinking may be.[15]

> They [the drinkers, who happened to be brothers] were raised in an immigrant household, in an Italian section of a large city. The parents, born in Italy, spoke little English, and clung to their Italian customs, including the drinking of wine with meals and on social occasions. The older of these boys conformed to the family background. He went from high school into a traditional Italian family business, and continues at age 45 to live next door to his parents. He married late, has two children still in grade school, and does not mention college among the goals he wishes for these children. The younger boy was brighter, more ambitious, and more aware of the differences between his background and that of his schoolmates. Eventually he rejected his background. He went to college, became an entrepreneur, married before his older brother, moved from the Italian community of his origin, and after several subsequent moves, each time to better neighborhoods, is now established in a superior residential section of a suburb. His children are preparing for college in private schools.
>
> The older man, like his parents, drinks wine on most occasions, though liquor is consumed in fair amounts. He says drinking makes him "more lively." He enjoys drinking, likes the taste and doesn't "drink for effect." The younger brother drinks "to be sociable" or "because others are drinking," while the older brother drinks "to make social occasions more enjoyable." The latter expresses pleasure in the situation; the former lacks this emotional involvement. In addition, the younger brother says that he drinks "when tense and nervous," and feels "relaxed" rather than lively after drinking.
>
> The older brother drank "fairly often" at home as a child, and had liquor before graduation from high school. The younger brother hated wine as a child. Even the smell of it made him sick, so that when the family

---

[15] Jones, Mary C. *Drinking and the Life Cycle* (in preparation).

> cleaned up after a party, he was excused from helping. Both men recalled this experience in their separate interviews—the older with humor, the younger with some repugnance.
>
> The older brother reports that his children have had wine with water at their grandparents' homes since an early age, and that he believes that young people should be allowed to take a drink with friends before age 21. The younger man thinks that youths should postpone drinking until they have come of age, although his teenagers now have a cocktail at home occasionally with the family. Neither of these men is likely to drink unrestrainedly, but the reasons which keep them in balance are quite different. The older man's drinking pattern, like that of his overall behavior, is integrated with his family role. He likes to drink for the taste and for the enjoyment it lends to a social occasion. There is no ambivalence about drinking or not drinking, no self-consciousness about . . . the amount or frequency, no concern about an occasional display of uninhibited impulse. He is tolerant with regard to young people drinking, especially groups of friends in their late teens.
>
> The younger brother shuns wine as the symbol of a background that marked him as "different" from his classmates and presented some handicaps to his educational and occupational ambitions. On the other hand, his drinking of beer and cocktails is symbolic of the higher social status he has achieved—he drinks because it is the thing to do in the circles to which he aspired and into which he has been admitted. But in addition, he drinks because he needs to when he is tense and nervous in the new cultural milieu to which he has climbed, and in the occupational roles that accompany his high income. But he is successful; he has "made the grade"; he knows how to control whim, pleasure, relaxation, and escapist tendencies. Drinking is a form of behavior engaged in without pleasure to display social status and, with discretion, to escape anxieties. This use of alcohol facilitates his social mobility, and provides limited release from the tensions created by this social striving.

It has been stressed that the same drinking pattern, as described in terms of frequency and amount, may have different meanings for different people. Nevertheless, it seems clear that drinking is meaningfully related to personality functioning. One of us has elsewhere outlined such a typology, according to which the drinking of a group or of an individual can be classified as primarily *escapist, facilitative,* or *integrative.*[16] Integrative drinking is illustrated by the case of the older brother just described. The key notion is that integrative drinking has a place among ongoing personality processes and is therefore not only satisfying in itself, but is also helpful in the attainment of the drinker's larger purposes. It is not a necessity, does not interfere seriously with the satisfaction of other needs, has a place in the conscious self, is not engaged in automatically or against the will, and is not followed by regret. Facilitative drinking is illustrated by the case of the younger brother. This is drinking that facilitates the nondestructive purposes of the individual without impeding integration of the personality. Escapist drinking, as the term implies, is the kind typically done to avoid the pains of frustration, anxiety, or emotional stress, and to gain by a short cut the gratification of impulses that cannot be admitted into the conscious ego. Patterns of abstaining may be classified in the same way.

This scheme is frankly normative, and is intended to meet the requirement stated above for a plan that can supply a basis for action. What is desirable is the integration of behavior and personality, both in those who abstain and in those who drink. This should be the basic aim of national alcohol policy and of alcohol education in schools and colleges. It is our belief that such integration of behavior and personality occurs, in the normal course of events, during the college years. Seniors who abstain, although they do not change greatly, are lower on Authoritarianism and higher on Impulse Expression, Social Maturity, and Developmental Status than freshman abstainers; and we would say on the basis of clinical impressions, that their abstinence is less militant and more integrative. Seniors, on the whole, drink more than freshmen, but there is no evidence that their drinking is more problem-determined or problem-generating. On the contrary, we judge from their higher scores on Social Maturity, Impulse Expression, and Developmental Status, and their lower scores on Authoritarianism, that they have made progress toward the integration of their personalities and that their drinking is thus more integrative. This is also what clinical impressions suggest. If, as has been suggested at various places in this book, the college experience can be made to favor even more progress toward personality integration than has been observed in our subjects, we may look forward to a time when alcohol-related problems among college students will have become rare or mild.

---

[16] Sanford, Nevitt. *Where Colleges Fail.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

10

CHANGES IN AUTHORITARIANISM

Max M. Levin

The term "authoritarianism" refers to a cluster of personality traits that predispose a person to be submissive to authority, dogmatic, and punitively moralistic; to deny some of his own impulses and needs, particularly dependence, weakness, and sexual urges; and to project unacceptable characteristics of his own nature onto outgroups against which he is prejudiced.[1]

---

[1] This brief formulation does not do justice to the complexity of the authoritarian character structure. The interested reader should consult the major report of the fundamental study: Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, Nevitt. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.

Some argue that authoritarianism is primarily a sociological phenomenon: the traits of the authoritarian cohere simply because they are the norms of people with little education and low socioeconomic status.[2] If that were true, authoritarianism would be rare among the college population. Students who qualify for admission to such institutions as Stanford and Berkeley have had more than a little education. Furthermore, if despite their education at these institutions, their authoritarianism persists, we are dealing with something other than educational or sociocultural deprivation. More likely such authoritarianism involves some relatively enduring personality characteristics.

In recent years, both Sanford and Loevinger have suggested that adolescence may be an authoritarian phase.[3] At least some youths adopt overly conforming, rigid, and dogmatic defenses to cope with conflicts deriving from emerging impulses and their control, as well as other dilemmas concerning the self, beliefs, and values. These views suggest that with the gradual decline of such conflicts during late adolescence and early adult years, authoritarianism should decline, at least in those individuals who are making normal developmental progress in managing and satisfying their impulses, especially impulses involving sexual behavior and autonomy, and are adapting adequately to social reality as well as to internal needs. This developmental model implies, of course, that such changes might well occur quite independently of college attendance, since developmental changes in personality can certainly occur in the absence of a college education. The findings of Plant,[4] and of Plant and Telford,[5] show that a decline in authoritarianism, dogmatism, and ethnocentrism (all interrelated characteristics) in young adults does occur in the absence of a college education.[6]

---

[2] Brown, R. *Social Psychology*. New York: Free Press, 1965.

[3] Sanford, Nevitt. "Developmental Status of the Freshman." In Sanford, Nevitt (Ed.). *American College*. New York: Wiley, 1962. Loevinger, J. "The Meaning and Measurement of Ego Development." *American Psychologist*, 1966, *21*, 195–206.

[4] Plant, W. T. "Longitudinal Changes in Intolerance and Authoritarianism for Subjects Differing in Amount of College Education of Four Years." *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1965, *72*, 247–87.

[5] Plant, W. T., and Telford, C. W. "Changes in Personality for Groups Completing Different Amounts of College Over Two Years." *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 1966, *74*, 3–36.

A developmental view of authoritarianism raises some interesting new theoretical issues, particularly with regard to whether certain aspects or components of authoritarianism undergo developmental changes while others do not. Moreover, the developmental issue needs to be viewed in the light of a typology of authoritarianism. It is conceivable that the developmental processes affect some types of authoritarianism, or some components of some types, but not others. The personality data and other information collected in the Student Development Study provide answers to some of these questions.

In the light of numerous reports (including the results of our study) that authoritarianism declines during the college years, change seems most likely among those whose authoritarianism as freshmen is relatively high. Further, it can be assumed that the authoritarian characteristics of a number of this group would be likely to change in varying degrees. The standard measures of authoritarianism are various forms of the Authoritarianism Scale (F) developed by Adorno and his associates.[7] We utilized a 32-item scale adapted from their Form 40, which has very high reliabilities. F-scale means for the Berkeley and Stanford freshmen who were also retested as seniors were 115 and 110 respectively, with standard deviations of approximately 26 and 24; these means were not significantly different from those of a random sample of the students who were tested only as freshmen at Berkeley and Stanford. Subjects whose scores were approximately one standard deviation or more above the group means were selected for study. The cutoff was relatively high: 139 (item mean, 4.34). This yielded a total of 68 students with usable freshman and senior F-scales.

Over the college years, the senior scores of two-thirds of these students declined by at least 25 points, while the remaining third changed much less. We referred to those who changed by 25 points or more as the LC (Large Change) group and those who changed by less than 25 points as the SC (Small Change) group. This division resulted in an LC group of 45 students, with an average F-scale score of 149 as freshmen, which declined to an average of 104.5 during the senior year; and an SC group of 23 students, whose average F-scale scores were 146 and 133.7 for the freshman and senior years respectively.

---

[6] For findings that lead to a contrary conclusion, see Trent, James W. and Medsker, Leland L. *Beyond High School.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968, Ch. 6.

[7] Sanford, Nevitt, Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., and Levinson, D. J. "The Measurement of Implicit Antidemocratic Trends." In Adorno, *et al. The Authoritarian Personality.*

Because of the range in freshman F-scale scores, there was some overlap in senior F-scale scores between the LC and SC groups. Thus, even some in the LC group who had changed considerably were still relatively high as seniors, while some in the SC group, who changed less, had lower F-scale scores as seniors than some of the LC seniors. This illustrates one of the difficulties encountered in studying change, the problem of the initial level. To circumvent this problem, another change group was developed, consisting of 17 subjects whose F-scale scores as seniors did not overlap with any of the senior scores in the SC group. This "purified" LC group, which we designated as PC, provided us with a group that not only had changed relatively—that is, with respect to their authoritarianism as freshmen—but in addition, had reached a relatively low level of authoritarianism.

Our research strategy called for a comparison of the Large Change and Small Change groups of students in order to unravel the factors associated with varying amounts of change in authoritarianism, including family background, and curricular and extracurricular college experiences. We also examined personal characteristics other than authoritarianism to see if these suggested other factors to explain the differences in susceptibility to change in authoritarianism. Finally, we attempted to determine whether the nature of authoritarianism differed initially among students who showed varying amounts of change during the college years.

We first asked whether there were any background characteristics that differentiated our various groups.[8] A student's sociocultural background may be inferred crudely from his father's occupation. Students whose fathers were in business were more numerous in the SC group than in the LC group (71 per cent and 47 per cent respectively), while students whose fathers were professional men, white-collar workers, or skilled workers, were more numerous in the LC group.[9]

---

[8] In this presentation of the results, differences will be designated only where they reach adequate statistical levels of confidence, minimally p values of .05. Most positive findings were, in fact, significant at considerably smaller p values.

In our samples of students, academic aptitude and performance was not associated with amount of change in authoritarianism. That authoritarianism is associated with intellectul and educational levels in broad samples of the population is well established; but apparently in the case of our students, either factors other than academic aptitude were associated with change in authoritarianism, or their range of academic aptitude was too narrow (on a very high level) for a relationship to become manifest.

To determine whose authoritarianism is more and whose is less apt to change developmentally, we turned to the various scales of the Omnibus Personality Inventory, described in Chapter 3. As freshmen, the LC group scored significantly higher than the SC group on the Social Maturity (SM) and Estheticism (Es) Scales. Most of the items in the SM Scale that significantly differentiate LC and SC subjects are in the intellectual and esthetic domains. A sample of 23 students in the LC group was compared with the 23 students comprising the SC group on 120 items of the SM Scale. The items that showed statistically significant differences were the following: "Trends toward abstractionism and the distortion of reality have corrupted much art in recent years" (LC, 8; SC, 14); "I like to listen to primitive music" (LC, 11; SC, 4); "I like to discuss philosophical problems" (LC, 13; SC, 7); "I like to read about artistic or literary achievements" (LC, 11; SC, 4); "Nothing about fascism is any good" (LC, 12; SC, 3); and "It's better to stick by what you have than to try new things you don't actually know about" (LC, 9; SC, 14).

When comparing two groups on 120 items, one may, of course, expect to find some differences to be significant as a result of sampling errors alone. But there is a consistency in the content of these items that suggests that we may be dealing with more than sampling errors. For example, the SC group seems to be slightly more ideological (politically authoritarian) than the LC group.

---

[9] This particular finding did not reach statistical significance and hence is suggestive only.

The responses also suggest that students in the LC group are higher in intellectual-esthetic interests and values even as entering freshmen. We can assume that such students are more likely to be influenced by an environment or by an institution that emphasizes such values than students without such preexisting values are. (As entering freshmen, the PC group was even higher in Social Maturity and Estheticism than the LC group.) It is possible that the relatively high F-scale scores of the larger change groups reflect conventional beliefs in family and social background. With increasing autonomy and cognitive development in a more sophisticated environment, authoritarianism often lessens.

We obtained information about many aspects of student life from the Senior Questionnaire. Only two questions out of seventy yielded significant differences between the LC and SC groups. Students in the LC group tended to evaluate their courses on the basis of how useful they would be to their careers, while the SC group was grade-oriented. A significantly larger segment of the LC group attributed the changes they underwent in college to ideas they had encountered in independent reading. Since these two differences show some coherence, and are in line with the higher intellectual disposition of the LC group, they may constitute more than a chance finding. Again, greater differences are found when we compare the PC and SC groups.

When asked to rank in order some fourteen interests and activities for the relative degree of importance they expect them to have in their future lives, the PC and SC groups showed some noteworthy differences as well as some striking similarities. The PC group gave top ranking to career or occupation, future family, and intellectual or artistic activities, in that order. The SC group also ranked career or occupation first and future family second, but set love and affection third. The least valued activities for the PC group were civic participation, sports or athletics, and religious beliefs and activities. For the SC group, the least valued were participation in activities directed toward national or international betterment, intellectual and artistic activities, and civic participation. Again the greater intellectual disposition of the PC group is apparent.

The type of residence lived in during the college years might well be expected to exert considerable influence on the amount of change in authoritarianism. In an earlier study made at Stanford, Siegel and Siegel did, in fact, find that F-scale scores of female undergraduates changed in the direction of the prevailing attitudes of their particular housing group.[10] But we found no differences traceable to college residence among our various groups. Plant, too, has recently reported no differences in amount of change in F-scale scores over a two-year period between sorority and non-sorority members.[11]

What impact do different aspects of the curriculum have on the student's basic beliefs and cognitive disposition? We found that the PC, LC, and SC groups differed much in the proportion of natural science majors they contained. Twenty-four per cent of the LC and 50 per cent of the PC groups majored in the natural sciences, in contrast to 10 per cent of the SC group. Thirty-five per cent of the SC group majored in the humanities and social sciences. What are we to make of these findings? One can readily postulate that the very essence of science is anti-authoritarian. Students exposed to critical, analytic thinking cannot long cling to reliance on authority, conventionalism, and dogmatism. There is also the possibility that the relatively greater precision and structure of the natural sciences are more effective in inducing change than the more ambiguous, relativistic concepts and the less certain findings of the social sciences and humanities. On the other hand, an authoritarian student exposed to the humanities might well find the relative absence of structure and the ambiguity quite intolerable. Further, the direct questioning of conventional and traditional social views and values that commonly occurs in the humanities and social sciences would immediately put him on guard.

We now turn to the question of whether differences in the nature or type of authoritarianism are the critical factors in varying degrees of change in authoritarianism. To find answers to this question, the author developed special subscales from among the many items in the Omnibus Personality Inventory. Ten subscales with varying numbers of items were developed. Since they are rational scales, no claim can be made for their homogeneity without empirical evidence. These subscales were designed to obtain scores on the following components of authoritarianism: conventionalism, authoritarian submission, primitive sexual moralism, dogmatism, anti-intellectualism, anti-ambiguity, religious fundamentalism, distrust and cynicism, power and toughness, and punitive moralism.

---

[10] Siegel, A. E., and Siegel, S. "Reference Groups, Membership Group, and Attitude Change." *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 1957, *55*, 360–64.

[11] Plant, W. T. "Changes in Intolerance and Authoritarianism for Sorority and Non-Sorority Women Enrolled in College for Two Years." *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1966, *68*, 79–83.

For the Large Change group, the changes were general, extending over all the dimensions of authoritarianism represented in our subscales. But this did not obtain for the SC group, which manifested change along some dimensions, but not others. This group changed significantly with regard to authoritarian submission, power and toughness, primitive sexual moralism, and punitive moralism. It is not unreasonable to assume that changes in these components of authoritarianism are probably developmental in nature. In achieving greater independence and autonomy from parents and parental surrogates, even the authoritarian adolescent can be expected to become less submissive. Similarly, with greater maturity, the grosser aspects of authoritarianism become modulated, and hence power and toughness also decline. Perhaps the development of a somewhat more mature sexual identity reduces the need to express cruel or sadistic tendencies. The decline in punitive moralism is a commonly reported phenomenon of the college years—a lowered judgmental attitude toward the deviant behavior of others, including sexual behavior. Thus, it would appear that even the SC group underwent significant change in some aspects of superego functioning, in the direction of a somewhat less harsh superego and somewhat more impulse freedom.

Equally significant, however, are the authoritarian dimensions along which the SC group manifested little or no change. It showed little change in cognitive content, that is, particular beliefs and attitudes, and in cognitive controls and styles. To us, this finding is unexpected and challenging. Those very dimensions of authoritarianism that might be expected to change more readily as a result of college education are precisely the dimensions that appear to have changed least in students whose F-scale scores remained elevated. On the other hand, the dimensions of authoritarianism that might be presumed to be more closely linked to superego and impulses are the dimensions that appear even in this group, to have changed more. Authoritarian aggression and submission, power and toughness—dimensions that might, on theoretical grounds, be assumed to be more centrally linked to the basic drive structures of the individual and thus be more resistant to change—are precisely the ones that showed more change in all our authoritarian subjects.

If we view these findings developmentally, they may seem less paradoxical. Late adolescence is that phase of the life cycle during which many impulses and defenses are reorganized. The achievement of greater autonomy and a clearer ego identity, the development of more integration, and control of the impulses are major developmental tasks achieved in varying degrees during this period. Our data suggest that even students who remain relatively high in authoritarianism progress in these directions, although somewhat less, to be sure, than others do. What has been referred to as the external superego can thus be said to become weaker during the college years, even for those whose authoritarianism otherwise changes relatively little; while the cognitive attitudes change less.

We suggest a congruence hypothesis with important implications for educators. Students with initially higher intellectual disposition are more likely to be receptive to influence from intellectual-esthetic sources because they value these more initially. By contrast, the less intellectual student might avoid or resist such influence because of his initially low valuation of intellectual activity. Thus, the impact of college on different students varies with the congruence or fit between the student's initial values and perspectives and those values evidenced by various components of the college culture. You cannot easily fit students who have low intellectual interest into an intellectual environment. More authoritarian students may prefer clear-cut structure, order, and precision to ambiguity, vagueness, and relativism. When they find congruent styles in the curriculum, they are more susceptible to the influence of the content and values of those courses.

Some form of challenge is commonly assumed to be an effective mode of educating and inducing change in students. But challenges that go too sharply against the student's cognitive grain may be precisely the techniques to be avoided. In the case of authoritarian students, well-organized, structured content and course style may be more effective in inducing change than the more general, less concrete, and more ambiguous, which they are apt to resist and reject strongly. So long as their authoritarianism persists, the liberalization and humanization of such students may more likely occur within more highly structured college environments, disciplines, and instructional approaches, rather than less highly structured ones.

It seems apparent that there cannot be one ideal curriculum suitable for all students. Yet we see little evidence that the need for diverse educational approaches is given sufficient consideration in higher education. In fact, we hardly have sufficient knowledge at present to provide a basis for differentiated higher education. Our findings indicate the need for experimental educational efforts. Authoritarian and otherwise anti-intellectual students present a considerable challenge, for their well-being may require educational methods distinctly different from those effective with other types of students. They must be led gradually, by means adapted to their particular life-style.

11

THE ACTIVIST REVOLUTION OF 1964

Joseph Katz

On September 14, 1964, a series of directives issued by the administration of the University of California at Berkeley set in motion a chain of events that led eventually to the mass student protest, or sit-in, of December.[1] On September 14, the Dean of Students announced that the sidewalk in front of the campus could no longer be used by the students for setting up tables, fund-raising, electioneering or recruiting, or giving speeches in support of off-campus political and social action.[2] Leaders of 18 campus organizations, including political groups ranging from the far right to the far left, met with the Dean of Students to discuss the prohibition. This resulted in some concessions, but students were still forbidden to advocate off-campus political or social action and to solicit funds and members. Participants have remarked that the nucleus of the Free Speech Movement (FSM) came into existence there in the Dean's office, as student leaders discussed the situation and decided on united action.

---

[1] There is a large literature on the Berkeley events. Three anthologies bring together some of the literature. They are Lipset, S. M. and Wolin, S. S. (Eds.). *The Berkeley Student Revolt.* Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Books, 1965; Miller, M. V. and Gilmore, S. (Eds.). *Revolution at Berkeley.* New York: Dell, 1965; Katope, C. G. and Zolbrod, P. G. (Eds.). *Beyond Berkeley.* Cleveland: World, 1966. See also Draper, Hal. *Berkeley: The New Student Revolt.* New York: Grove, 1965; Lipset, S. M. and Altbach, P. G. "Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States." *Comparative Education Review,* 1966,

There had been indications during the summer of 1964 that some students would be pressing for educational reforms, and there was talk among these students that if their arguments did not meet with a satisfactory response, they might, in order to gain a better hearing, resort to tactics similar to those used in the civil rights movement. In September 1964, the *SLATE* Supplement Report published "A Letter to Undergraduates," by Bradford Cleaveland, which contained a critique of undergraduate education at Berkeley, and ended with a series of demands:

> 1. Immediate commitment of the university to the total elimination of the course/grade/unit system of undergraduate learning in the social sciences and humanities.
> 2. Immediate disbanding of all university dorms and living group rules which prescribe hours and which provide for a system of student-imposed descipline, thereby dividing students against themselves.
> 3. Immediate negotiations on the establishment of a permanent student voice which is effective (that is, independent) in running university affairs.

10, 320–349. A review of the literature and an interpretation of student activism has been prepared for the U. S. Office of Education by Joseph Katz under the title *The Student Activists: Rights, Needs, and Powers of Undergraduates.* See also Sampson, Edward E. (Ed.). *Stirrings out of Apathy: Student Activism and the Decade of Protest. The Journal of Social Issues* (whole issue), 1967, *23*.

[2] See the chronology of events in Miller and Gilmore, xxiv–ix.

4. Immediate efforts to begin recruitment of an undergraduate teaching faculty to handle undergraduate learning in social sciences and humanities.

5. Immediate negotiations regarding two methods of undergraduate learning which provide for the basic freedom required in learning:
   a. A terminal examination system which will be voluntary, and an option with "B."
   b. Immediate creation of undergraduate programs of a wide variety in which the student will be given careful, but minimal, guidance, without courses, grades, and units.

6. Immediate establishment of a university committee to deal with these demands on the Berkeley campus.[3]

The publication of the above document did not create much of an impact. An editorial in the *Daily Californian* of September 17 called Cleaveland's letter a "needless noise." It rejected his demands as impractical in a university of 27,500 students. The editorial ended by saying that despite "university red-tape, instructors' disinterest, rules and academic deadlines, the individual student gets whatever he wants out of this University in direct proportion to what he puts in—no matter who is in charge, no matter what the rules." Nevertheless, these demands, which sounded rather utopian in 1964, have since become the center of discussion at Berkeley and elsewhere, and some have been met—in large part because of student pressure. What sort of students responded to academic strictures with resistance? In what ways were they different from their peers? Before we answer these questions, let us review briefly the genesis of the Free Speech Movement.

The students who were to visit the Dean's office on September 14 and form a nucleus of protestors against administrative restrictions on free speech were part of what was to become a vast, coalescing movement of student activists who were soon to demand academic freedom of various sorts on campuses all over the nation. Throughout its history, the FSM was a loose, at times internally dissenting, coalition of quite different groups of the student community. It was in this sense quite properly a "movement" rather than a "party." Much of the increasing élan and size of the movement resulted from the arousal of more student resentment by subsequent actions of the administration, until the issue became focused on the relatively simple principle of political freedom, rather than on the more complex one of educational reform, about which students and faculty differ considerably in involvement and sophistication.

---

[3] Cleaveland, Bradford. "A Letter to Undergraduates." In Lipset, S. M., and Wolin, S. S. *The Berkeley Student Revolt.* New York: Anchor Books, 1965, p. 80.

A series of student protest actions including an all-night vigil, the setting up of tables in violation of University regulations, and a sit-in followed the Dean's pronouncement. This course of action culminated on October 1 in a crowd of students surrounding a police car in which a student under arrest had been placed, and preventing it from moving off. The roof of the car became a speaker's platform. This protest lasted until the following evening. It ended with an agreement between the students and the administration, and a victory for the students, which included the dropping of charges against those arrested.

The days that followed brought a series of arguments, charges, countercharges, and demonstrations. The FSM itself was split at times over what was the desirable course of action. Over the Thanksgiving holiday, the Chancellor sent out letters charging four members of the FSM with leading, organizing, and abetting the illegal demonstrations on October 1 and 2, and also charging a number of organizations that had participated in the FSM with violating campus regulations. It had generally been assumed that those events were officially forgotten. The Chancellor's letter resulted in increased mass protest, and an ultimatum was issued by the FSM. When the administration ignored the ultimatum, about a thousand students moved into Sproul Hall for a sit-in on December 2.

The sit-in was preceded by a noon rally that attracted thousands of students. Mario Savio, speaking at the rally, announced the broad purpose of the protest: "There comes a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you cannot take part; you cannot even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the wheels, and the gears, and all the apparatus, and you have to make it stop. And you have to make it clear to the people who own it, and to the people who run it, that until you are free, their machine will be prevented from running at all."

Eight hundred people prepared to spend the night inside Sproul Hall. In the words of a member of the FSM Steering Committee: "On the fourth floor, we set up a study area. On the third floor, classes were held. The number of classes soon became greater than the space available on that floor, and we spread to the stairwells and the basement. There were classes taught by TA's and others in Math, Anthropology, Genetics, several languages, and the civil rights movements in the Bay Area. A class on civil disobedience was taught in the fallout shelter. On the second floor we watched movies—on the serious side, about HUAC, on the light side, Charlie Chaplin. Joan [Baez] toured the building and led folk singing. On the first floor, a full-fledged Chanuka service was held, which eventually broke into dancing and other festivities."

At three the following morning, the Chancellor appeared, and went to each floor of Sproul Hall and urged the students to disband or face arrest. At about four the arrests began, and they lasted through the afternoon of the next day.

The sit-in was followed by a strike and a meeting of the university community called by the president of the student body in the Greek theater. At the end of the meeting, Mario Savio rose to make an announcement, and was seized by the throat and dragged from the platform by three policemen—an incident that freshly aroused the students, who shouted "Let him speak! Let him speak!" The following day, over 900 faculty members attending a session of the Academic Senate voted 824 to 115 in favor of a resolution against control of student speech and political advocacy. Regulations about time, place, and manner of political activity were to be restricted to those necessary for the normal functioning of the university, and disciplining of students in regard to political activities was to be in the hands of the faculty as the final authority. The FSM, viewing this proposal as an endorsement of the objectives they had been fighting for, immediately supported it. The Associated Students of the University of California (the official student government) did likewise.

On January 2, the Board of Regents named a new acting Chancellor. Things were quiet during the second semester. The new Chancellor appointed a select commitee of the Academic Senate to make a careful examination of the academic and non-academic situation of the students at Berkeley. This committee, under the chairmanship of Professor Charles Muscatine, worked for a full year, and in March 1966 published its report.[4] The Muscatine Report called for many changes, including the establishment of a Board of Educational Development, which was to be an agency of constant innovation and self-examination. Also, in the spring of 1965, Professor Joseph Tussman was given permission to start his experimental program involving radical changes in the academic program for the freshman and sophomore years. This program was put into operation in the fall of 1965 with a first group of 150 students.

A committee of the Board of Regents appointed Jerome C. Byrne, a lawyer, to prepare a special report on the recent events and to make proposals for reform. The report by Byrne and his staff, published in May 1965, concluded, among other things, that "the Free Speech Movement enjoyed widespread support among students on the Berkeley campus. The large numbers participating in the various demonstrations established this fact. A reliable survey of student opinion, which we have had reviewed by independent experts, concludes that, before the December sit-in, about two-thirds of the students said that they supported the FSM's objectives, and about a third supported its tactics. Subsequent surveys showed that support increased after the December sit-in." Upon its publication, the Byrne Report was strongly criticized by some of the regents.

While these events were going on at Berkeley, many other institutions across the country were experiencing student protests. According to a survey made by Richard E. Peterson of the Educational Testing Service, based on 849 accredited four-year institutions, 38 per cent of the colleges reported student protests over the issue of civil rights. Smaller percentages reported protests in the area of instructional quality, with 12 per cent reporting protests over poor quality of instruction, 8 per cent over the generally prevailing system of testing and grading, and 7 per cent over curriculum inflexibility.[5] Just as at Berkeley, students were mobilizing everywhere in larger numbers over political issues than over educational ones. Nevertheless, it would have been interesting to have the same survey repeated for 1965–66. We formed the impression, through observation of campuses and by reading the student press during 1965–66, that larger numbers of students have become involved in educational issues, and that the activists have increasingly become representative of the broad mass of students.[6]

---

[4] Muscatine, Charles (Ed.). *Education at Berkeley: Report of the Select Committee on Education.* Berkeley: University of California, 1966.

Underneath the specific chain of events at Berkeley there were more superficial and deeper causes of the student revolution. On the more superficial side were lack of administrative flexibilty and sensitivity, and inadequate channels of communication between administration, faculty, and students. More deeply, there were (and are) such factors as increasing pressure on the student for high academic performance, preceded by similar pressures in high school and succeeded by the prospect, as required schooling lengthens into graduate institutions, of continuing years of being subjected to grading and testing. These more demanding standards are particularly hard for the student to accept because there has been no commensurate attempt to make the contents of the requirements more meaningful to him by relating them more fully to his own purposes, interests, and motivations. Further, there were the pressures and confusion over the military situation. (The ever-present possibility of the draft makes staying in school a necessity, and prevents the often desirable opportunity of a temporary break for work, travel, or self-renewal.) Finally, swelling numbers of students have enormously increased the size of the university populations, but no attendant attempts have been made to decrease the resulting dehumanizing effects.

Among the "positive" determinants of student activism are economic affluence, with its opportunities for the commodities and style of life that enhance the sense of self; the confidence gained by students at such prestige institutions as Berkeley by the academic successes they have achieved in their previous schooling; the experience of the civil rights movement, which not only has given students training in the tactics of dissent, but also a new sense of the power of individuals, or at least of groups of individuals, to influence the course of social and political events. Finally, throughout the 1960's there has been considerable mitigation of the "McCarthyism" that threw a pall over political life during the 1950's. After twenty years of affluence, values are being reexamined. Some members of the present college generation are taking a more fundamental look at social institutions.[7]

---

[5] Peterson, Richard E. *The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964–1965.* Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

[6] See Katz, Joseph, and Sanford, Nevitt. "The New Student Power and Needed Educational Reforms." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 1966, *47,* 397–401.

Reactions to the events at Berkeley have varied considerably. Many see them as a breach of law and order; many consider the FSM as pioneering a social renewal. Some observers have pointed out the similarity of the FSM to previous protest movements in educational history, while others have viewed it as one more instance of the conflict between generations, and of adolescent rebellion. Historical and psychological interpretations of the FSM have relevance. At the present, just as at times in the past, social circumstances are favorable to the universal tendency of adolescents to establish their own identity more firmly by simultaneously differentiating themselves from their parents and by redefining and modifying social institutions that they perceive as inimical to human growth. In this lies the particular contribution that adolescents can make to the self-renewal of society.

But the FSM may also be the first sign of a new form of consciousness in student society, just as labor has acquired a new form of consciousness during the last 100 years. Conceivably, the relationship between educators and educated is in the process of redefinition, with the students participating to a much greater degree than in the past. It may result in a change in who determines what about educational content, but also an earlier assumption of autonomy by the young—a redefinition of the role of the student, in which he is integrated into the work, social, and political processes of society in an active manner, rather than being primarily a tacit consumer of culture developing academic or social skills for later use.

---

[7] For a more detailed discussion of the causes of the student revolution see Katz, J., and Sanford, N. "Causes of the Student Revolution," *Saturday Review,* December 18, 1965, pp. 64–66, 76, 79.

What were the characteristics of the students who took an active part in the FSM movement? We studied 62 Berkeley seniors (35 men and 27 women) who were arrested during the December 2 sit-in. (The names of these students were obtained by checking the list of those arrested against our master list of all entering Berkeley students in the fall of 1961.) We have Scholastic Aptitude Test data for 61 of these students, senior-year cumulative grade-point averages for 47, freshman Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) data for 42, senior OPI data for 23, and Senior Questionnaire data for 22. We had five of these students in our longitudinal interview sample, and we interviewed an additional six who were not part of the original interview sample. Forty-two of the arrested students had been given six OPI scales, and the Authoritarianism (F) and Ethnocentrism (E) Scales when they entered as freshmen in 1961; and 23 of them also responded to these same scales in the spring of 1965. The arrested men and women (Table 63) differed from their classmates as freshmen by scoring significantly higher on scales measuring Social Maturity (autonomy, flexibility, capacity to relate well to other people), Impulse Expression, Estheticism, and Developmental Status. They scored about the same as their classmates on a scale measuring Schizoid Functioning (social alienation and bizarreness of thinking). The men scored lower than their classmates on a scale measuring Masculinity-Femininity. (This scale is somewhat mislabeled and tends to measure interest: that is, low scorers express less interest in science and more in social and esthetic matters; they also admit to more awareness of adjustment problems and feelings of anxiety.) The arrested students scored significantly lower than their classmates did on scales measuring Authoritarianism and Ethnocentrism (see Table 64).

If one compares the personality scale scores of the arrested seniors with those of their classmates, the same differences are obtained as were obtained in the freshman year. (The difference between the two senior male groups on "masculinity," though about half a standard deviation, does not reach statistical significance.) The FSM students thus continued to rise on the personality measures between their freshman and senior years, and were con-

TABLE 63

Table 63

SCORES ON EIGHT PERSONALITY SCALES OF MEN STUDENTS ARRESTED AND SAMPLES OF BERKELEY FRESHMAN AND SENIOR MEN

	Freshmen							Seniors				
	Arrested[a] (N = 10)		*Arrested* (N = 20)		*Not arrested* (N = 1026)			*Arrested* (N = 10)		*Not arrested* (N = 286)		
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	p[b]	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	p
Social Maturity[c]	60	(11)	61	(9)	50	(10)	< .001	67	(8)	57	(11)	< .01
Impulse Expression	55	(10)	57	(9)	50	(10)	< .01	62	(10)	52	(11)	< .01
Schizoid Functioning	52	(9)	52	(8)	50	(10)	n.s.	52	(12)	47	(11)	n.s.
Masculinity-Femininity	44	(7)	43	(8)	50	(10)	< .01	42	(9)	47	(13)	n.s.
Estheticism	60	(9)	61	(8)	50	(10)	< .001	65	(7)	52	(12)	< .001
Developmental Status	59	(13)	60	(11)	50	(10)	< .001	69	(9)	58	(11)	< .01
	(N = 11)		(N = 19)					(N = 11)				
Authoritarianism[d]	93	(25)	92	(26)	116	(26)	< .001	70	(29)	96	(26)	< .01
Ethnocentrism	45	(18)	42	(15)	56	(21)	< .01	30	(16)	44	(18)	< .02

[a] These are the students for whom we have both freshman and senior personality test responses. The two groups (freshman-senior and freshman only respondents) responded in nearly identical fashion.

[b] p is for the difference between students arrested (N = 20) and students not arrested (N = 1026).

[c] This and the following five scales are reported in standard scores. The standard scores were computed separately for each group on the basis of their freshman scores. A standard score of 50 is the mean raw score on each scale for the total male (N = 1026) and total female (N = 852) populations, respectively, tested in 1961. The following are percentile equivalents of the standard scores: 50 = 50, 55 = 70, 60 = 84, 66 = 95, 70 = 98.

[d] This and the following scales are reported in raw scores. The number of students arrested for whom we have responses on this scale is slightly different from the number on the other scales.

Table 64

SCORES ON EIGHT PERSONALITY SCALES OF WOMEN STUDENTS ARRESTED AND SAMPLES OF BERKELEY FRESHMAN AND SENIOR WOMEN

	Freshmen							*Seniors*				
	Arrested[a] (N = 13) *Mean*	*(SD)*	*Arrested* (N = 22) *Mean*	*(SD)*	*Not arrested* (N = 852) *Mean*	*(SD)*	p[b]	*Arrested* (N = 13) *Mean*	*(SD)*	*Not arrested* (N = 265) *Mean*	*(SD)*	p
Social Maturity[c]	60	(10)	60	(9)	50	(10)	< .001	66	(7)	58	(10)	< .01
Impulse Expression	57	(8)	55	(9)	50	(10)	< .05	59	(9)	52	(11)	< .02
Schizoid Functioning	47	(9)	47	(9)	50	(10)	n.s.	46	(12)	46	(11)	n.s.
Masculinity-Femininity	47	(8)	48	(10)	50	(10)	n.s.	49	(9)	48	(10)	n.s.
Estheticism	56	(10)	56	(8)	50	(10)	< .01	62	(8)	53	(10)	< .01
Developmental Status	60	(10)	59	(9)	50	(10)	< .001	69	(8)	59	(11)	< .01
	(N = 9)		(N = 20)					(N = 11)				
Authoritarianism[d]	87	(33)	81	(24)	113	(27)	< .001	70	(13)	89	(26)	< .02
Ethnocentrism	32	(12)	33	(9)	50	(18)	< .001	27	(4)	39	(16)	< .02

[a] See Note a, Table 63.
[b] See Note b, Table 63.
[c] See Note c, Table 63.
[d] See Note d, Table 63.

siderably ahead of their fellow seniors. Our data are in line with the data reported by Heist, and Watts and Whittaker.[8] Our own results enlarge on theirs by including personality inventory data for FSM students at the time of their entering Berkeley in 1961. Heist, and Watts and Whittaker, reporting on several samples of members of the FSM, including a sample of 130 arrested students, show that the FSM students scored considerably higher both on cognitive and affective personality scales when compared with samples of other Berkeley seniors. Thus, they scored higher on such measures as Thinking Introversion, Theoretical Orientation, Estheticism, Autonomy, and Impulse Expression. These authors also report that FSM students who participated in the Sproul Hall sit-in included Humanities and Natural Science majors in about the same proportion as the rest of the Berkeley student body. The social sciences had a larger representation in the FSM than in the rest of the student body; but only 1.3 per cent of the FSM respondents were majoring in Business and Engineering, in contrast to 17.8 per cent of the student population. The educational family background of the FSM respondents also is different: 26 per cent of the FSM students had fathers with advanced academic degrees (M.A. or Ph.D.), while this was true of only 11 per cent of a random sample of the Berkeley student population as a whole.

The FSM students were already different from their fellow students upon entrance. Their capacities for autonomy, awareness, and action were considerably higher than those of most of their classmates. One might raise the question, therefore, whether their personality characteristics, rather than the influence of the university, propelled them. But we know that personality characteristics are only a set of potentials. An environment other than Berkeley in 1962–63 might not have influenced them as much in the direction of increasing social awareness, capacity for self-exploration, and social action. One may even surmise that under other conditions, this psychological potential would have turned more in the direction of cynical rebelliousness or isolation.

With reference to the high scores of the FSM students on

---

[8] Heist, Paul. "Intellect and Commitment: The Faces of Discontent." Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1965 (mimeographed); Watts, W., and Whittaker, D. N. E. "Free Speech Advocates at Berkeley." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 1966, 2, 41–62.

Social Maturity and Impulse Expression, our interviews of people who have been measured by these scales have contributed to our belief that high scorers on these two scales tend to include a large proportion of people who are conflicted and have an eventual history of trying to resolve their conflicts. Interview and questionnaire data confirm this for the FSM students. They tended to come from family backgrounds marked by free expression of differences, and their histories in college often showed much turmoil. At the same time, these students also showed a high degree of reintegrative ability and self-awareness—a capacity for criticizing themselves, and seeing themselves in perspective. While they projected some of their inner conflict onto the outer world, they were also particularly keen observers of conflicts, discrepancies, and absurdities in the outer world. (One might argue that from the point of view of society and its perennial needs for reforms and self-renewal, people with these personality characteristics are particularly suitable for pointing out existing shortcomings and initiating reforms. In the process, they serve themselves as well as society.)

The FSM students reinforced impressions obtained with other students that a certain amount of dissent or even disagreement between parents and within the family is an incentive toward achieving greater autonomy. It is as if the expression of difference among their parents allows the child emotional freedom to explore his own individual inclinations and to express them. (Where, however, parental conflict is more hostile, or is responded to by the child with a greater degree of hostility, the child's attempt at self-assertion seems also to become more tortured and diffused.) We found that many parents of our interviewees turned out to have a history of involvement with relatively unorthodox ideas or actions.[9] This is of special interest in the light of the fact that the FSM students were particularly assertive in their rejection of adult authority and the middle-class way of life, and in their claim that no one over thirty could be trusted. They seemed, at the same time, to be attempting to realize their parents' ambitions

---

[9] Since this was written, Flacks has reported that data from two of his studies show that "activist students come predominantly from relatively liberal backgrounds." Flacks, Richard. "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest." *Journal of Social Issues, 23,* 3, 52–75.

—ambitions their parents had been forced to suppress in part because of the depression and its aftermath. They criticized authority and held a purer version of the values that their parents also had held at their same age. We found that the arrested students received moral support from their parents. As the mother of one of the interviewees put it, when notified of her daughter's impending arrest: "As your mother, I'm worried and frightened for you, and I wish you wouldn't do it. As a person, I support your position. And as both, I am very proud of you."

In academic aptitude and performance, the arrested students scored above the rest of their classmates. On the verbal part of the Scholastic Aptitude Test, the arrested students' mean scores were significantly higher than those of the non-arrested students (Table 65). The spring 1965 cumulative grade-point averages of the arrested men and women are significantly higher than those of their fellow seniors (Table 66).

TABLE 65

FRESHMAN SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST SCORES FOR ARRESTED STUDENTS
(RANDOM SENIOR SAMPLES[a] AND ALL ENTERING FRESHMEN IN 1960)

MEN

	Arrested (N = 34)		*Not Arrested* (N = 400)		*1960[b] Freshmen* (N = 1857)	
SAT	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*
Verbal	611	(81)	522	(84) •••	548	(93)
Mathematical	611	(86)	617	(76)	606	(88)

WOMEN

	Arrested (N = 27)		*Not Arrested* (N = 400)		*1960 Freshmen* (N = 1494)	
SAT	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*
Verbal	610	(101)	559	(88) ••	544	(86)
Mathematical	535	(95)	531	(87)	519	(88)

[a] Strictly speaking, these are fall 1961 entrants who were in school in the spring of 1965. Some of these had not attained senior standing.

[b] 1960 scores of all entering freshmen are provided for comparison purposes.

••• $p < .001$

•• $p < .01$

TABLE 66

CUMULATIVE GRADE-POINT AVERAGES IN THE SPRING OF 1965 OF ARRESTED SENIORS AND OF RANDOM SENIOR SAMPLES [a]

	Men				*Women*			
	Arrested (N = 25)		*Not Arrested* (N = 400)		*Arrested* (N = 22)		*Not Arrested* (N = 400)	
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*	*Mean*	*(SD)*
GPA	2.93	(.40)	2.64	(.45) **	2.87	(.38)	2.65	(.39) *

[a] See Note a, Table 65.
** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Thus, even by conventional academic standards, these students were among the more highly achieving ones in the university.[10]

The picture that emerges from the Senior Questionnaire responses of the arrested students is one of a group of students who describe themselves as having been greatly influenced by ideas presented in courses, by teachers, and by close relations with teachers and other adults. They say they are primarily oriented toward the intellectual contents of their courses. More frequently than their peers, they describe themselves as having changed much in personal characteristics, freedom to express their feelings and

[10] Our data are in conflict with the reports by Watts and Whittaker, "Free Speech Advocates at Berkeley," in which there was no significant difference between the Fall 1964 GPA of 137 FSM undergraduates of all classes (2.62) when compared with a cross-section of 115 undergraduates (2.53). Our own data are corroborated by those reported by Heist, *Intellect and Commitment;* by those collected by Somers, a Berkeley sociologist; and by another survey cited by him (see Somers, R. H., "The Mainsprings of the Rebellion." In Lipset and Wolin, p. 344). Further corroboration of a link between high academic performance and activism comes from Robert Nichols, who reports that self-ratings and ratings by teachers and peers "all agree in characterizing Merit Finalists more frequently than less able students as independent, assertive, unconventional, cynical, rebellious, and argumentative." They are also described more frequently as "mature, dependable, well-adjusted, and honest." Merit Finalists "report more involvement in campus political activities, more organizational and leadership positions, and more discussion of political, social and religious issues with teachers and peers than do samples of average students." It is amazing how much this picture of the Merit Finalists agrees with our picture of the FSM students. (Nichols, Robert C. "The Origin and Development of Talent," in *National Merit Scholarship Corporation Research Reports,* 1966, 2, No. 10, 7.)

---

desir
port
on a
repor
each

arrest
but r
civil
much
were
mate
repor
simil
the a

thing
hero
Hess
reste
other
stude
or so
after
arres
Corp

lived
press
stron
they
tion
were
"ver
mate
with
classr
respo
calle

desires and their political views since entering college. They report greater struggle and conflict than their classmates in deciding on a major. They disagree more frequently with their fathers, and report their parents more frequently as strongly differing with each other.

There was little difference between the arrested and non-arrested students in their reported participation in social activities, but not unexpectedly, the arrested students had participated in civil rights activities and national or community political activities much more frequently than their classmates. The arrested students were much more permissive in sexual attitudes than their classmates, but in behavior, only the arrested men, not the women, reported a higher degree of sexual intimacy during college. A similar sex difference showed up with regard to drinking behavior: the arrested women are much like the non-arrested ones.

With regard to other questionnaire responses, a number of things should be noted: the arrested students named as their heroes various civil rights leaders and such literary figures as Hesse, Melville, and Orwell. The educational plans of the arrested students were focused on subjects and occupations involving other people and social objectives. Thirteen of the twenty-two students planned to do graduate work in education, social science, or social welfare. Thirteen also planned to be engaged ten years after graduation in teaching, social work, or social research. The arrested students also indicated a greater interest in the Peace Corps than their classmates did.

After their freshman year, most of the arrested students lived off-campus, rather than in university housing. They expressed dissatisfaction with the university administration more strongly than the rest. One hundred per cent of the men said that they were "very dissatisfied" with the relations of the administration to the students, while only 26 per cent of their classmates were "very dissatisfied"; 63 per cent of the arrested women were "very dissatisfied," while only 22 per cent of their female classmates were. (If one combines those who were "very dissatisfied" with those who were "moderately dissatisfied," the figures for their classmates are: men, 59 per cent, and women, 47 per cent.) In response to an open-ended question, half of the arrested students called for more personal communication between administration and students, and the other half called for more due process and student participation in or control of decision-making and policy.

An intense and aware struggle in reaching their present phase of development was reported by the arrested students. The women put developing their identity as a person before other values. The men reported themselves more frequently than their classmates as greatly influenced in their development by understanding themselves as persons, by dealing with crises in their relationships to other people, and by confronting problems in themselves. They described themselves more frequently than their fellow students did as having engaged in a struggle of conflicting thoughts and feelings when deciding on a major, and said that they had changed much in their freedom to express their feelings and desires. In response to an open-ended question, half of the arrested students stressed their gains in self-respect, self-knowledge, and sense of security. The other half stressed increased interest and ability in intellectual pursuits. Half of them singled out their participation in the FSM as an important influence for change. The other half said that either professors or close friends had affected them strongly.

The arrested students came face to face with dissent, and their passage through college was a stormy one, but their struggles and conflicts went hand-in-hand with increased awareness and active attempts at achieving integration. There were paradoxes in their lives, in that they felt in disagreement with established authority and yet were supported either by their parents, or by their parents' values. They organized themselves, temporarily, into a movement; but they retained reservations about organizations and bureaucracies, which have the power to thwart the expression of individuality. Thus, as we have indicated, the FSM was a movement at times well-organized and at times almost breaking apart. Its participants frequently saw themselves as Thoreau-type individualists who could join a movement only for a very limited time. In this regard, they differed greatly from the student activists of the 1930's, who accepted political organization much more readily. The current activists are almost conservatively American in their emphasis on individual autonomy. The contrast between the political and economic objectives of the activists of the 1930's and the more broadly humanistic and educational objectives of the activists of the 1960's is pronounced.

The "paradoxes" we have just noted do not point so much to inconsistency and conflict as they do to the attempts of the activists not to be impaled on either horn of such dilemmas as the need for joint social action and for individual freedom, and the need to be guided by adult models without becoming constricted by excessive acceptance of them.

The desire for meaningful human contact was especially marked among these young people. In spite of their attacks on authority, they had closer relationships to teachers and other adults than the rest of the students. Having closer relationships with peers and being able to do something for other people were particularly important objectives for them. Especially when they stress doing things for other people, activists mean to suggest a serious deficiency in present undergraduate education, which at its best seems to aim at preparing the person for better individual performance and to neglect, particularly in the academic sector, experience both in concerted action and in action that serves or is of use to other people. In spite of the appearance of gregariousness that colleges give, particularly residential ones, there is much social isolation. As one of our FSM interviewees remarked, the possibility of establishing closer relations with other students was a powerful secondary motivation in joining the movement. "A lot of honest relationships were made . . . it was great because you had 'instant relationships.' All the things that normally take days or weeks to find out about a person, you already discerned."

The activists strongly desired to see the world outside themselves more clearly. They tried to see the world objectively in its state of complexity, while at the same time attempting to do something about remedying the situation. They experienced conflict in others and in themselves, but this conflict seemed to sharpen their perception. Unlike the "neurotic," they did not turn to a frustrated self-involvement, but toward the community and the world. One might say that these students needed to make the world whole in order to make themselves whole: to bring psychological and social objectives into harmony. Adolescence is a particularly good time to aim at such psychological and social wholeness.

It is the time when a person can remake himself—expand beyond the possibilities and limitations established by his prior upbringing. In their search, adolescents invariably manage to touch upon factors that are inadequate in their environment—it is adult immaturity that tries to dismiss them as idealistic, impractical, or merely rebellious. Adolescent dissent gives society a tremendous chance. By virtue of their less encumbered vision and relative noncommitment to the established order, adolescents can make a major contribution toward society's self-renewal. (As a student writer pointed out recently, we have stressed the contribution of universities to society, but not said enough about their role in criticizing and reforming society.)

In their protest, the students actually put their fingers on many deficiencies in educational reality that had been neglected by faculty and administration. It would be missing much of the significance of this protest to think of it primarily in "housekeeping" terms—deficiencies in channels of communication or in "legal" arrangements. The fundamental thrust of the student protest was the result of a more or less deep dissatisfaction with the educational process, its content, methods, and personnel, and its inadequacies in meeting the students' developmental needs, including their intellectual ones. It is conceivable that the activists have succeeded in initiating a redefinition of the college adolescent's role, moving toward earlier autonomy, earlier participation in the social and political processes, including education, and earlier usefulness to other people.

We interviewed Tom, one of those who was arrested, on June 11, 1965. Among other things, we asked him to give us a retrospective account of events on the night of the sit-in, December 2. In Tom's case, we were dealing with a student whose moment of decision occurred during the very night of the sit-in; so that he may be describing in a condensed form what took place over longer periods of time for other students. Of course for our student, too, the decision was preceded by a long period of gestation. One of the most striking features of his description of the sit-in is that his decision to permit himself to be arrested not only came from a sense of public responsibility to contribute to reform and to underline the injustices of existing conditions, but also was seen by him as essential for establishing his own personal and private integrity. He was very aware of the possible external consequences of his act for himself, but he saw the situation as requiring a choice between his becoming an adult that he could respect, and diffusing and diluting his own life.

In quoting from the interview, we will focus on the student's process of arriving at his decision, but we will also include some of the things he said about what was going on around him. There is an existential feeling about the report given by this student, who is a science major. His account of his attitudes and behavior during the night of the sit-in, like the others we have collected, clashes sharply with many newspaper-engendered images of these students—images that feed the adult stereotype of the adolescent's dangerousness and tendency to delinquency. One wonders as one reads this student's description of the brutalities he experienced and witnessed during the night of the sit-in whether it was not quite an education for him to be confronted with the seamy side of the fabric of society—to be brought face-to-face with the evil in people and institutions. Such an "ordeal" with the "dragon" has always been considered a necessary rite of passage to adulthood. William James had something similar in mind when, in his *Moral Equivalent of War*, he called for a confrontation of the young with the "sour and hard foundations" of man's higher life. For purposes of such confrontation, society is not likely soon to run out of material illustrating injustice and stunted development; but one might perhaps expect the university to provide help and comfort in this confrontation rather than to be itself the scene of it.

Tom first heard about the sit-in on the afternoon of December 2. He had missed the rally, but in his opening remarks, he referred to the speech by Mario Savio from which we quoted earlier. He originally planned to spend only a short time at the sit-in, particularly because he had classes the following day—attending classes takes precedence over revolution.[11]

> I didn't hear the rally that day, the one where Mario made his speech—a very good speech, beautiful metaphors. I missed that, and I didn't even know that there

---

[11] The following excerpts from the tape-recorded interview have been edited slightly for the sake of readability.

was a sit-in til about five in the afternoon. I happened to be walking to the student store, and so I found out pretty fast, and I turned around and walked home. I went back and made three or four sandwiches, and put on two jackets that I could use as a pillow, and brought Latin vocabulary cards so I could study. There was, of course, no commitment to stay, but I definitely wanted to go in. I met a few people in there I knew. We talked, and sat around. That was a messy period, probably the most confused period, because people were in there milling around. It was about five-thirty, maybe a little bit later. They hadn't closed the doors yet, so the people were walking inside and out. But after they closed the doors, about seven, people were still milling around and doing various things, and then they began to get more organized. They started to have—it was some Jewish holiday—the rabbi comes down and he's conducting a service. It was very good. Then various people were serving coffee. They sent down to the store and had someone buy two cartons of cigarettes and put them in a bag and threw them up.

I was just amazed at the organization of the whole thing. It had been planned before, all the various aspects, including what to do about bathrooms, and what happens if people get sick. They had all these things planned: how to get food in and out, what types of food, how much; cigarettes, coffee; what to do with the waste paper; it was amazing. It turned out that at the most crucial period during the whole sit-in, they didn't have communication. When they had isolated us, we didn't have windows to look out—we were surrounded by police so we couldn't do anything. We had no connection with the outside for about twelve hours, so we didn't know what was going on, and that became kind of horrible for us after a while because of this one idea that, I think, popped into everyone's head: this action that you're doing personally has a meaning for you, but it has a meaning outside for you, too—and whether you're going to be a martyr or a traitor is divided by a very slim line.

So we didn't know what was going on. And then I watched the Charlie Chaplin movies, which were good, and I studied Latin for a couple of hours, talked to various people all around, and then started to find a corner somewhere so I could sit down and go to sleep. Then about one-thirty in the morning, newspaper reporters came and took everyone's picture, and turned on these

> great big flood lights, and everyone was screaming obscenities all over the place, because they wanted to get some sleep. I felt that I would stick out the night, but I had an eight o'clock class the next day, and I was going to it; so I would do my part for the protest and stay the first night, and then if I could come back, I would the next day, but I was not going to miss my classes. Of course, I didn't consider seriously the possibility of being arrested. From a logical standpoint, it was the most ridiculous thing to do. It would essentially have made us all martyrs, which it did. It would have given the protest a great deal of popularity with everyone, including the professors, which again it did. So I would say that logically the best thing for the administration to have done would have been to let us sit there—and I'm sure that, let's say, four hundred people would have walked out by ten o'clock the next day, just because of classes. [The sit-in] would have lost all its emotion and probably would have been a tremendous failure. Well, I can't say that for sure. It just would not have been a climax. So, therefore, I supposed that the administration would do the most logical thing and not arrest people. Well, of course, I didn't realize then what the administration was composed of, and I didn't realize that they were very, really scared, frightened to death, and not very rational in making decisions, so again this leaves us with a particular insight into administrators. I'm a little more suspicious now than I was; a little more critical.

Around two in the morning, Tom heard for the first time that the police were on their way. He says there was a very tense period from about one-thirty to three, because he felt isolated and didn't know what was going on.

> You have a general idea that the police are going to come. You don't know what they're going to do when they do come, and there's nothing you can do in the meantime. So there's a lot of tension going on, and again people are talking very nervously. They just didn't know what was about to happen. They had a lot of doubts and a lot of fears that came out too. But then someone again started singing. This is a tremendous emotional relief during a time like this, and everyone, whether he could sing or not, was screaming and yelling out the civil rights song, which is all very comforting, too, because it gives a feeling of unity.

Tom had been up since six on the morning of December 2. As it turned out, he was not arrested until the afternoon of December 3. He described how during the night the students were all packed in "like sardines," and when, at about five-thirty he got up to go to the bathroom, it took him twenty-five minutes to get there because he had to step between so many bodies. People were lying down, motionless and still, but they weren't asleep. "There was just too much doubt, fear, and tension; and you just couldn't sleep in that place. People were talking; they were just kind of lying and staring and thinking." So Tom sat down, and these thoughts went through his mind:

> I figured if I was going to get arrested, let's have it over fast, so I won't have a chance to change my mind. That was the worst time. I was there from about nine-thirty, sitting in that position from nine-thirty to three o'clock, when they finally arrested me. So during that period I was just going over and over in my mind everything that happened up to that time—why I should get arrested or why I shouldn't—what were the arguments involved. One very strong argument was I had worked for the defense industry during one summer at college. I'd made a hell of a lot of money, and at that time, a lot of money represented my freedom to me. I wanted to be able to get a decent job afterwards; I didn't want to be discriminated against on the grounds that I'd been arrested before.
>
> I wasn't sure how much my particular idea of the protest would be associated with the FSM's, so that was another thing that I was concerned with, because I wanted it to be a kind of tool of my arguments; I wanted to be able to express my individuality; and I just didn't know if this was going to have this effect. So again there was doubt in that area. But then after thinking over all these things, I realized that the real motivating force was education, and that I really was not too happy with the idea of going to school for four years just to get a degree, so that you can go on and on and on, and so that you can get good jobs in society and stuff like that. This was the big argument between myself and my parents. They both graduated from college before the depression; so they both had degrees, and it didn't matter what the degree was in, what subject, they could get good jobs. So this became all-important to them, and perhaps was the only concrete thing that they ever pre-

sented to me. So I realized then that I wasn't happy with this emphasis on getting a degree. I wanted the degree to mean something; I wanted it to represent a certain level of something that I had acquired after working for four years or fighting with myself for four years. So it finally occurred to me that here was a beautiful method —a beautiful way for me to rebel officially. I'd really had my freedom—been pretty independent all the way along —but I never established the type of rapport with my parents where they accepted me, not as their son, but as, let's say, another individual, another adult, which is very important. So I finally felt that this was going to be in one way a protest against my upbringing. It was also a justified protest—a criticism of the fact that they were striving for a degree instead of an education.

I don't like [to be locked up], so I began to get kind of excited. About two-thirty, I started getting this smile on my face that stayed with me throughout the night, I guess, because I knew I was going to enjoy what happened. I began noticing things around me—mostly these stupid police officers. When they came up to our floor to arrest us again, they changed their techniques. They had apparently got some sort of arresting engineers up there to determine what would be the most efficient way to do these things. I was also very concerned about whether to go limp or not. In the beginning I could not see really what relation this had to the protest as a whole—could not see why delay was so important, especially since it had been going on so long. But the penalty for resisting an officer is a $2,000 fine and a year in jail, so its something to seriously consider.

We had been given the phone number of a lawyer, if they asked. They didn't ask; they didn't inform us of our rights. So I didn't know what was going on, because I had never been arrested before, and I didn't know when to ask for legal counsel, which we were also instructed to do. By the time that I had finally made certain decisions and come to an understanding of what I was doing, and what I was about to do, I also began to see that going limp was important for other reasons, too. Within the whole area of the protest, the sit-in, we had not accepted those laws that we were supposedly violating. When they came up to me, there were four men all gathered around. One had a tape recorder, one was writing out a slip, and one was reading a speech that had been prepared. This one informed me that I was doing something against the law, and did I know it, and if I

> didn't leave I'd be arrested, something like that. He offered me an opportunity to get out, to get up and walk out, and I wouldn't be arrested or anything. I thought this was a contradiction—here I was under arrest and then I wasn't, and then he was giving me a chance to not be under arrest. So I asked him about it. I said I thought that I had already been under arrest and that I had been just waiting here to be taken out. He said, "Oh, no, no, no! You know it's not like that at all! You can get up and walk out. Do you want to?" I said no. So he was a little bit upset by that, and he was a little bit flustered, but finally went back to his speech. So he started reading on, and then they took my picture, and then got down to the last part of the speech which was—I'm trying to get the wording, which was so beautiful, so poetic: "Will you act like a gentleman and walk out with me?" It was like that—and I just about laughed. I didn't expect it to be this comical, and I was kind of stunned there for a while, because I didn't know exactly what to say.
>
> What I had noticed was that when other people went limp they were still scared, and that they tensed up. Because of this, they had gotten some rough treatment. So when [the officers] grabbed me by the shoulders, two of them, and started grabbing me right here, on the shoulder blades, I felt these fingernails digging into my shoulders, I just raised my arms and they grabbed me underneath the arms, which was nice, and I really went limp. I almost fell asleep. I'd been waiting twelve hours in that one position, and you know this was the end, the climax, and it was getting pretty exciting, but I guess my nerves were shot—I'd been up thirty hours, something like that—it was unbelievable. But I was so limp they just dragged me across the floor, and they got going at a good pace and picked me up and threw me. So I was off the ground for a couple of seconds at least. By that time, I just didn't give a damn what happened—I didn't care whether I fell on my head or what. It just so happens that I didn't tense up, and because of that, I was caught when I fell.

About three-thirty in the afternoon, Tom finally got out and was put on a bus to be transported to prison. As he sat down, everyone in the bus "turned around and looked for half a second or so" and it made him "feel good." "They were saying that I may be doing something outside of myself which will be important outside of myself." His self-esteem and sense of usefulness thus bolstered, he began to feel anger and wondered how he could have been "so foolish" as to think that the police would treat him "like another human being" instead of "taking out their aggressions" on him. The last person to get on the bus was a fellow student. "They dragged him by his hair. I felt this was just going overboard; they were not being sane. Apparently he'd blacked out on the way down, so they had dragged him down by his hair instead of by his feet, and he was in a hell of a lot of pain when they got him out and put him in the seat."

The students were driven to the Santa Rita prison farm, and parked next to the booking office, but were not let out of the bus. They sat there for about three hours, discussing things, and yelling and screaming from time to time. They struck up conversations with some of the police officers and asked them how they viewed the protest. They also posed the question of what the officer would do if Governor Brown were his immediate commander and advised him to shoot them. The officer answered: "Well, of course not. I would be defying my own boss, but it would be because he was wrong. You don't deserve to be killed for doing this." Then a lieutenant got on the bus and said, "You know what I think? I think all you bastards are Commies, and this is a great big Commie conspiracy. My daughter wanted to go to Berkeley, but now I'm not going to let her." "Your daughter couldn't get into Berkeley," the students replied.

By this time, one of the big issues was when they were going to be let off the bus to go to the toilet. They were tired and hungry. Eventually one of the officers left the bus, then returned, saying that he couldn't find any authorities, and they would have to stay in the bus.

> So then we didn't know what to do. Some were suggesting we protest, and some were suggesting we climb out of the windows. So we divided up into debating teams. Somebody had a watch and was going to time the various arguments. We were going to have a ten-minute presentation on each side, and after that, we were going to vote on the action to take. Everyone joined in on this, and it made us feel better. Very passionate, strong argu-

> ments were going up. The question involved was whether we were going to be silent to get our way, or protest to get our way. So after a very long, painfully democratic debate, we took a vote and it turned out to be pretty much fifty-fifty. But the protestors had it over the non-protestors. So what we decided to do was to protest for eight minutes, and then sit quietly for ten minutes and see what happened.

The students lifted up the windows of the bus and made as much noise as they could. The women students who had been arrested heard them in their barracks about 50 or 70 feet away, and they too began screaming and yelling. This protest brought results; they were let into the station and given a sandwich each. Booking took another three to four hours. Fifty-two of the students were crowded into a small, unventilated transfer cell for twenty minutes. They were then let into the barracks, but searching them took another hour. At one-thirty Tom finally got to lie down in an unheated bunkhouse.

Toward the end of the interview, the interviewer commented that Tom seemed to have a very good grasp of his whole involvement. Tom responded to this by saying:

> Well, I'll tell you that I was frightened that if perhaps I didn't have a good grasp, I would end up going slightly insane too, because the problems were immense. I could see around me that people were very confused. They knew emotionally and intuitively they were doing something, but they didn't quite see what. They couldn't articulate it rationally, and that was quite a problem. Also, at certain times during the last semester I was busy studying, and I got left out on things that occurred. I found it very difficult to find a straight story about what had happened, even from the official FSM statements, which were often ambiguous and sometimes just wrong, incorrect. I couldn't trust them. I read them, and then I compared them with what other people had to say. I tried to get a statement from the administration, and I found out that such statements were so ambiguous you didn't know what was going on, or what happened. It was very important for me to have a grasp of what had actually happened before I could actually support anything or not. So at the time, if you didn't follow things specifically as they happened—and it took quite a lot of energy to get out and sort them out—but

> if you didn't, and the time came for action, and you wanted to participate but you didn't see things clearly and you couldn't justify it to yourself, there's a chance that you might hate yourself afterwards.

Finally, when Tom was asked what he had been doing in his last semester at college, after the arrest, he once more illustrated the discontent with educational procedures that had been a major base for the FSM protest. Tom reported studying a series of modern plays for one of his courses. He seems to have gone about it in a workmanlike, critical, and analytic fashion, but he received a "D" on his first midterm exam. He felt this was because he did not conform to the "rules" of test responses. After he had "psyched out" what was wanted, he performed better.

> I used to read a lot of plays, but this was in high school, and I haven't for a long time, so I took a not very interesting English class and a course in modern British and American drama. I got to read up a lot on O'Neill and Shaw, and everyone else in between. It was very pleasurable, but my first midterm came back with a D minus on it. I didn't realize why. I finally found out it was the way I was approaching it—taking each individual play and analyzing it, showing where actions between characters would create this characterization that would lead to a full knowledge of the characters itself, to a place where you can anticipate the next action, given any particular situation, and then, how the actions of the characters relate to the theme of the play. But when you have to be tested on eighteen plays in an hour, and you're given two questions, then all you can do is say something that's general. They wanted a general comparison of themes of plays. So after I'd figured that out, I could look at the plays both individually, as units in themselves, and then as parts of other sets, and see general themes and compare them. I think I did fairly well, but it didn't require knowledge of any of the plays, which was too bad.

In spite of his involvement in the FSM and the activities connected with his trial, Tom said he "did quite a lot of thinking and learning academically even while participating full time in this other direction." "Maybe too much time is bad for an educational system like this. The questions I ask myself and find important to answer aren't necessarily the ones they are going to test me on." Tom seems to have implicitly raised the question of motivation. As we found elsewhere in our study, students who otherwise complained of insufficient time would find they could easily take on a time-consuming additional task if it was meaningful to them.

The strong intellectual interest and intellectual independence shown by Tom was typical of the students arrested during the sit-in. They were students whom most professors would rate as very desirable because of their motivations and their intellectual industry. We are confronted with a revolt of the intellectuals, not of the anti-intellectuals. Such students have taken the claims of the university to be an intellectual community seriously—in part because of the very excellence of the university they have been attending—and they simply want more of it, and want it better. There were students like this in the so-called "silent generation" of the "apathetic" Fifties; but their potential for involvement and activity did not coincide with as favorable a situation. Perhaps education might develop a psychological Keynesianism that would awaken students in "apathetic" times through the stimulation of autonomy and dissent. When students offer suggestions and dissent, we should consider them as an educational gift—a gift to their own education as well as to that of their teachers.

Activist students are a minority, but a rapidly growing one. There are many students who tend to accept their "education" passively, and who are insufficiently touched, stimulated, or awakened by their experience in college. The activists, by their example, have already helped to broaden these students' intellectual and valuational horizons. But closer attention to students different from themselves is likely to benefit the activists. From the perspective of their often generous and enthusiastic natures, many activists seem to see other students too easily in their own image. They would grow in tolerance and gain an enlarged perspective on human nature if they realized that theirs is only one way of achieving identity, and that other students may achieve their own particular "wholeness" in ways quite different from theirs. Intellectual awareness and excitement, enlarged social consciousness, and reform-mindedness are "universals"—qualities desirable in every educated person. In this lies the challenge and moral appeal of the activists.